DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 636 FL 021 125

AUTHOR	Rivera, Natasha F.
TITLE	Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education, Community School District 3, 1991-92. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	T003600091
NOTE	156p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Inservice Teacher Education; *Language of Instruction; Limited English Speaking; Middle Schools; Native Language Instruction; Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; *Spanish
IDENTIFIERS	Content Area Teaching; Middle School Students; *Two Way Bilingual Education

ABSTRACT

A federally funded two-way bilingual education program implemented in New York City (New York) elementary and middle schools is described and evaluated. The program served 392 students in its second year, 158 of them limited-English-proficient (LEP) and 234 English-proficient (EP). It provided English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction to LEP students and Spanish language instruction to EP students, and content-area instruction with Spanish and English used equally in grades K-4 and English used about two-thirds of the time in grades 5-8. The project had an active parent involvement component, including ESL classes, educational field trips, and workshops involving both students and parents. Teachers could attend weekly staff development meetings and have college tuition reimbursed. The project met its objectives in ESL, content-area for LEP students, 4 of 5 staff development areas, and parent involvement. It did not meet content-area objectives for EP students, but their performance was comparable to city-wide performance. It did not meet objectives for Spanish as native and second languages. One staff development objective was not measurable. Recommendations include improved measurement of the unmeasured staff development objective or adjustment of the objective, and exploration of additional techniques to improve EP student English reading, mathematics, and Spanish reading. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356636

Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education
Community School District 3
1991-92
Grant Number T003600091
EVALUATION REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL 021 125

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

H. Carl McCall
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Keysha Z. McNeil
Student Advisory Member

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

2/93

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by the Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood Evaluation Unit of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. Thanks are due to Natasha F. Rivera for collecting the data and writing the report.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Dr. Tomi Deutsch Berney
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
New York City Public Schools
110 Livingston Street, Room 732
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 935-3790 FAX (718) 935-5490

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Introduction 1

- Setting 1
- Students' Characteristics 1
- Needs Assessment 2
- Narrative Description 2
- Staffing 3
- Materials 5
- Staff Development Activities 5
- Parent and Community Involvement Activities 5

II. Evaluation Methodology 6

- Objectives 6
- Instruments of Measurement 7
- Data Collection 8
- Data Analysis 8
- Evaluation Validity 9

III. Evaluation Findings 10

- Student Outcomes 10
- Staff Development Outcomes 19
- Parental Involvement Outcomes 20

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 22

APPENDIX A 24

APPENDIX B 31

APPENDIX C 36

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

TABLE 1 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Grade 12

TABLE 2 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE) Reading, by Grade 13

TABLE 3 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE) Mathematics, by Grade 15

TABLE 4 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Reading Subtest of the Language Assessment Battery and Examen de Lectura en Español, by Grade 16

TABLE 5 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics (MAT-M), by Grade 17

TABLE 6 Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) Test), by Grade 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education was an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII-funded project in its second year of operation. The project functioned in Manhattan's Community School District (C.S.D.) 3 at P.S. 84 and its middle school. It served a total of 392 students, 158 of whom were limited English proficient (LEP) and 234 of whom were English proficient (EP). This represents an increase of 122 students over the previous year, due in part to the expansion of program services to eighth grade students. The project provided English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) instruction to LEP students and Spanish as a Second Language (S.S.L.) instruction to EP students. It offered content area instruction with a dual language approach (English and Spanish were each used one-half of the time in kindergarten through grade four and in a ratio of 65:35 in grades five through eight). The project also provided services to staff and parents of participating students.

The project targeted LEP students (those who scored at or below the 40th percentile on the Language Assessment Battery [LAB]), who showed an achievement lag of more than one year in one or more content areas as measured by standardized achievement tests. The participation of EP students was voluntary, with their parents' consent.

The project had an active parental component, which included E.S.L. classes, educational field trips, and activities and workshops that involved students as well as parents.

Teachers of participating students had the opportunity to attend weekly staff development meetings. The project also reimbursed college tuition fees for staff.

The project met its E.S.L. objective, the content area objectives for LEP students, four of its five staff development objectives, and its two parental involvement objectives. The project did not meet its content area objectives for EP students; their performance, however, was comparable to that citywide. The program did not meet its objectives for Spanish as native and second languages. The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) could not measure one of the staff development objectives, because the project did not develop the required evaluation indicator.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Develop a criterion-referenced test to measure the staff development objective or request modification of the objective to make it possible for OREA to evaluate it in the future.

- Explore additional techniques to increase EP students' acquisition of skills in English reading, mathematics, and Spanish reading.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report documents the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII project, Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education.

SETTING

The program operated at P.S. 84 and its middle school in Community School District (C.S.D.) 3 in Manhattan. The student population in C.S.D. 3 was 39 percent Latino, and 47 percent African-American; the remaining students were European-American and Asian-American. Most (74 percent) came from low-income families and were eligible for the free lunch program.

At P.S. 84 and its middle school, the ethnic distribution of the students was very similar to that of C.S.D. 3. Of the 800 students that attended P.S. 84 during the 1991-92 school year, 54 percent were Latino, 33 percent were African-American, 10 percent were European-American, and 3 percent were Asian-American. Of these students, 20 percent (158) were LEP, and 70 percent came from low-income families. At the middle school, the students were 95 percent Latino, 4 percent European-American, and 1 percent African-American. Ninety percent of these students came from low-income families, and 60 percent were LEP.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The Model Developmental Program for Bilingual Education served a total of 392 students; male students numbered 182 (46.4 percent), female 210 (53.6 percent). The project used scores on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) to determine if students were LEP, with those students scoring at or below the 40th percentile classified as LEP. There were 158 LEP students (40.3 percent) and 234 EP students (59.7 percent).

The majority of the project participants (64 percent) came from Spanish-speaking families but were born in the United States. Those students who were not born in the United States had a mean of 3.3 years (s.d.=1.9) of education in their native country and a mean of 3.3 years (s.d.= 2.3) of education in the United States. Fifty-five percent of the participants came from low-income families and were eligible for the free lunch program.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Before instituting this program, C.S.D. 3 conducted an exhaustive needs assessment of the targeted LEP and EP students, their families, and the educational staff who were to serve them. The data obtained from this study indicated two primary needs: (1) to provide LEP students with intensive language instruction and support services to improve their school performance, and (2) to offer staff development activities for teachers and paraprofessionals. The study also showed that the parents of EP students greatly desired second language instruction for their children.

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

During the 1991-92 school year, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education provided instructional and support services to 392 Spanish- and English-speaking students and their families. Two hundred and thirty four (59.7 percent) of the students were English proficient (EP), and 158 (40.3 percent) were limited English proficient (LEP). The project's main goal was to promote the acquisition of English language skills in LEP students and Spanish language skills in EP students.

To meet this goal, the project used developmental bilingual instructional methodologies, including a partial immersion model, and activities to foster the integration of LEP and EP students and awareness of their own and other cultures. The project also provided parental involvement activities for the parents of participating students and offered staff in-service development activities and reimbursement for college credits.

STAFFING

Title VII

The project's Title VII staff included the project director, a language development specialist, a school neighborhood worker, and a secretary. The project director and the language development specialist held master's degrees, the school neighborhood worker had an associate's degree, and the secretary was a high school graduate. The project director and the language development specialist were native speakers of Spanish, and the school neighborhood worker had communicative proficiency in this language.[*] The project had difficulty in finding a secretary who was proficient in Spanish. The project director reported that she would continue to search for a bilingual secretary for next year.

---

[*] Communicative proficiency is defined as a non-native speaker's basic ability to communicate and interact with students in their native language.

The project director's responsibilities included the supervision and coordination of the project's activities, staff selection and training, and the coordination of the project's evaluation. The director had more than 11 years' experience in the field of teaching LEP and EP students. The language development specialist's responsibilities were to assist classroom teachers in the development and implementation of developmental instructional activities, to provide in-service activities and training to parents and teachers of participating students, and to select instructional material. She also had over 11 years' experience in her field. The school neighborhood worker assisted in the dissemination of information, helped organize and conduct parental involvement activities, and served as a parent ombudsman.

Other Staff

Tax-levy funds paid the salaries of the 19 classroom teachers and additional support personnel who provided instructional services to project students. All of these teachers were proficient in English. Sixteen teachers were native speakers of Spanish, one non-native speaker had teaching proficiency* in Spanish, and two were monolingual in English. The native speakers of Spanish held bilingual common branches certification; the others held common branches certification.

Most of the teachers had one to six years of experience in teaching LEP and EP students. Twelve teachers held master's degrees, 11 held professional certificates, and all had training in bilingual and multicultural education. All teachers met the appropriate New York State certification requirements for their respective areas of instruction.

---

*Teaching proficiency is defined as the ability to use LEP students' native language in teaching language arts or other academic subjects.

MATERIALS

During the 1991-92 school year, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education developed and disseminated a pamphlet in Spanish and English describing the philosophy, goals, and design of the program.

For a list of instructional materials used in the project, please see Appendix A.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Teachers received tuition assistance toward coursework in bilingual education. Teachers of participating students participated in a series of monthly and weekly activities sponsored by the bilingual district office. Workshops focused on Spanish-language and E.S.L. activities and reading in a dual language curriculum.

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The project sponsored a wide variety of parental and community involvement activities that included weekly workshops, E.S.L. and Spanish as a Second Language (S.S.L.) classes, field trips, and a college-oriented program at Mercy College for parents to obtain their General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.) and go on to college.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

OBJECTIVES

Student Outcomes

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1991 to June 1992), 200 kindergarten to fifth grade students (100 LEP and 100 EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) beyond gains achieved during the initial year in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1991 to June 1992), 150 sixth to eighth grade students (75 LEP and 75 EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) beyond gains achieved during the initial year in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.

Staff Development

- Twenty-five percent of the trainees will complete at least 6 college credits (3 last year and 3 this year) in appropriate courses.

- An additional 15 percent of the trainees will complete 3 college credits in appropriate courses.

- Forty percent of the teacher trainees (not including those who achieved this criterion last year unless it is in a different content area) will achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction, depending on which content area training they participated in.

- Fifty percent of the new teacher trainees will be able to utilize developmental bilingual instructional methodologies when working with target pupils.

- Fifty percent of the second year trainees will display further enhanced developmental instructional skills.

Parental Involvement

- Seventy percent of the parent participants will increase skills and knowledge in the areas within which they took instruction, such as E.S.L./S.S.L., native language arts, high school equivalence, computer learning, home-based remediation and enrichment for students, how to make instructional materials from household items, basic intermediate and advanced conversational English/Spanish for adults, and citizenship education.
- Fifteen percent of the parent participants will master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers.

INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT

OREA assessed the English and Spanish as native and second language student outcome objectives by comparing the pre- and posttest scores on the LAB, the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics (MAT-Math), and the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE).

To assess the staff development objectives, OREA examined the college records of program trainees and the pre- and post-LAB scores of their pupils. OREA also developed and distributed a Likert-type evaluation questionnaire on which teachers had the opportunity to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the staff development activities that took place during the school year (see Appendix B). Because the project did not have the time to develop its proposed criterion-referenced test, OREA could not assess the staff development objective for achievement in content area instruction.

In order to assess the parental involvement objectives, OREA developed and used a Likert-type questionnaire (see Appendix B). In addition, the school principal evaluated the parents' ability to work as effective volunteers.

In order to assess the parental involvement objectives, OREA developed and used a Likert-type questionnaire (see Appendix B). In addition, the school principal evaluated the parents' ability to work as effective volunteers.

DATA COLLECTION

To gather qualitative data, an OREA evaluation consultant visited the school site and interviewed the project director several times during the school year. The project director gathered data and, in conjunction with the evaluation consultant, completed the Data Collection and Evaluation System provided by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) and sent it to OREA for analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

OREA used a gap reduction design to evaluate the effect of dual language instruction on project students' performance on the standardized tests. Because of the difficulty in finding a valid comparison group, OREA used instead the groups on which the tests were normed. Test scores are reported in Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.s), which are normalized standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.1. It is assumed that the norm group has a zero gain in N.C.E.s in the absence of supplementary instruction and that participating students' gains are attributable to project services.

To assess the significance of students' achievement in English and Spanish, OREA computed a correlated t-test on LAB and Examen de Lectura en Español (ELE)

N.C.E. scores.[*] The t-test determined whether the difference between the pre- and posttest scores was significantly greater than would be expected by chance variation alone.

EVALUATION VALIDITY

The Model Developmental Program for Bilingual Education and OREA minimized error by providing for the proper administration of the evaluation instruments at twelve-month testing intervals; training test administrators in procedures; scoring tests and converting scores electronically; and using data collectors, processors, and analysts who were unbiased, with no vested interest in the success of the project.

---

[*] Details for the evaluation design using the spring 1991 Spanish LAB administration as a pretest and the spring 1992 ELE administration as a posttest will be forthcoming.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

STUDENT OUTCOMES

English and Spanish as Native and Second Languages

The evaluation objectives for English and Spanish language development as native and second languages were:

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1991 to June 1992), 200 K to 5th grade students (100 LEP and 100 EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) beyond gains achieved during the initial year in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.
- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1991 to June 1992), 150 6th to 8th grade students (75 LEP and 75 EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) beyond gains achieved during the initial year in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education carried out all instructional activities specified in its original design. Throughout the school year, students had ample opportunity to develop their native and second languages while learning subject matter.

Kindergarten through second grade students had one teacher. Content area instruction was in English one day and Spanish the next. Third and fourth grade classes had two teachers and two classrooms, one for each of the languages, and students attended each classroom on alternate days. In the fifth through eighth grades, teachers taught content areas in Spanish 35 percent of the time and in English 65 percent of the time.

Teachers of participating students used a wide array of strategies and techniques. Lower grades used cooperative learning groups, whole language learning, manipulatives, and hands-on activities. Higher grades used reading groups, student-produced newsletters, and research projects and experiments. The project incorporated a strong cultural component into its various curricula in order to foster knowledge of the students' native culture and promote an understanding of different cultures.

The project director reported that this year the project had an innovative activity in which Latino and other writers spent ten weeks visiting different classes. During this period, students had the opportunity to meet real-life role models, discuss the processes that go into writing and publishing a book, and subsequently to put together class books.

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education provided OREA with its student identification numbers, which OREA used to obtain the scores from citywide tests centrally. The project also provided OREA with scores for the SABE.

There were complete pre- and posttest scores on the LAB for 124 students from grades one through eight. (See Table 1.) Gains for reported students were statistically significant (3.6 N.C.E.s) and higher than that of the previous year (2.6 N.C.E.s). The project met its E.S.L. objective.

The project provided OREA with complete pre- and posttest scores on the reading subtest of the SABE for 133 first to eighth grade students, and on the mathematics subtest for 131 students. In the reading subtest of the SABE, all grades except third showed significant gains (4.29 N.C.E.s.). (See Table 2.) In the

TABLE 1
Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Grade

LEP Students (English Language Gains)

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t*
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	value
1	30	21.27	11.7	20.40	14.4	-0.87	12.4	-0.38
2	21	13.71	8.3	24.76	25.0	11.05	21.1	2.40*
3	13	22.46	14.8	22.15	5.0	-0.31	12.6	-0.09
4	13	19.46	10.5	24.77	17.1	5.31	16.6	1.15
5	8	17.50	11.3	29.5	25.8	12.00	15.5	2.19
6	12	16.58	11.9	22.00	19.0	5.42	11.3	1.67
7	14	22.00	18.9	28.29	19.2	6.29	10.0	2.35*
8	13	26.08	12.8	20.08	14.6	-6.00	7.4	-2.93*
Total[a]	124	19.81	12.8	23.38	17.9	3.56	14.9	2.66*

*$p < .05$

[a] Data were missing for 10 students.

- Overall, gains on the LAB were statistically significant.

TABLE 2
Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE) Reading, by Grade

LEP Students

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	Difference Mean	Difference S.D.	*t* value
1	32	20.50	15.3	26.44	17.4	5.94	5.9	5.66*
2	22	28.55	16.9	33.00	17.5	4.45	8.6	2.44*
3	13	36.54	13.6	39.23	15.1	2.69	4.6	2.11
4	13	37.77	17.8	40.31	20.0	2.54	6.8	1.35*
5	9	54.56	12.4	57.11	14.5	2.55	6.9	1.12*
6	13	41.85	20.8	44.39	19.6	2.54	3.5	2.61*
7	14	49.29	21.3	53.29	21.3	4.00	2.7	5.63*
8	17	55.47	19.0	61.47	20.4	6.00	5.4	4.55*
Total[a]	133	36.98	21.1	41.27	21.6	4.29	6.0	8.19*

$^*p<.05$

[a] Data were missing for 1 student.

- All grades except third made statistically significant gains on the SABE (Reading).

mathematics subtest of the SABE, all grades showed a statistically significant gain (5.56 N.C.E.s). (See Table 3.) The project met its content area objective for LEP students.

The project provided OREA with pretest scores on the reading subtest of the Spanish LAB and posttest scores on the ELE. Matching scores were available for only 54 students. (See Table 4.) While there were gains at some grade levels, scores overall decreased from pretest to posttest, and it is probable that the small number of scores was not representative of the total group. The project did not meet its objective for Spanish as a second language.

OREA obtained complete pre- and posttest scores on the MAT-Math for 139 EP students from grades three through eight. (See Table 5.) Scores for the fourth grade went up; scores went down for all other grades, as was similar to the trend citywide. The project did not meet its mathematics objective for EP students.

OREA analyzed complete pre- and posttest scores from the D.R.P. test for 129 students from grades three through eight. (See Table 6). Again, all grades showed decreases in their scores except the fourth, which showed an increase. This reflected the trend shown citywide. The project did not meet its reading objective for EP students.

TABLE 4
Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Reading Subtest of the Language Assessment Battery and Examen de Lectura en Español, by Grade

EP Students (Spanish Language Gains)

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		t value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	8	30.38	23.3	39.13	7.8	8.75	27.7	0.89*
4	12	51.75	21.0	49.66	20.7	-2.08	10.6	-0.68
5	6	45.50	20.4	46.17	32.9	0.67	22.8	0.07
6	11	69.73	23.3	58.18	11.8	-11.55	20.9	-1.83*
7	5	48.60	33.1	67.20	13.3	18.60	28.9	1.44*
8	12	52.25	22.5	45.33	25.4	-6.92	11.1	-2.15*
Total	54	51.37	25.2	50.11	21.0	-1.25	20.7	-0.45

*p<.05

- Overall, students showed a loss from pre- to posttest.

TABLE 3
Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE) Mathematics, by Grade

LEP Students

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t* value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
1	31	22.74	7.2	26.19	8.0	3.45	6.4	2.99*
2	22	24.09	15.8	33.59	14.7	9.5	8.0	5.58*
3	13	36.92	18.5	40.07	19.2	3.15	3.1	3.63*
4	13	38.08	17.1	41.62	18.2	3.54	3.5	3.64*
5	9	50.89	9.1	55.00	8.2	4.11	3.4	3.62*
6	12	43.42	20.0	47.84	19.1	4.42	2.6	5.94*
7	14	48.57	23.0	55.71	24.6	7.14	11.5	2.32*
8	17	57.06	57.1	65.06	18.4	8.00	5.3	6.25*
Total	131	36.94	20.2	42.50	20.7	5.56	6.8	9.41*

*$p < .05$

[a] Data were missing for 3 students.

- All the grades made statistically significant gains on the SABE (Mathematics).

TABLE 5
Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics (MAT-Math), by Grade

EP Students

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t* value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	24	67.33	19.8	60.33	26.4	-7.00	21.8	-1.57
4	17	47.65	27.6	55.82	15.5	8.18	16.1	2.09
5	20	69.45	21.2	67.40	21.7	-2.05	9.8	-0.93
6	26	65.42	21.9	59.61	17.6	-5.80	10.7	-2.76*
7	22	67.14	21.4	63.55	19.8	-3.59	2.1	-1.74
8	30	60.43	15.5	56.93	17.2	-3.50	7.6	-2.52*
Total[a]	139	63.35	21.6	60.44	20.0	-2.91	13.78	-2.49*

*$p < .05$

[a] Data were missing for 24 students.

- Overall, students showed a loss on the MAT-Math. The trend was similar to that seen citywide.

TABLE 6

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) Test, by Grade

EP Students

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		t value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	22	44.73	23.7	43.68	21.6	-1.05	19.4	-0.25
4	16	52.12	23.4	54.00	29.6	1.88	16.1	0.47
5	19	57.47	26.6	55.84	21.7	-1.63	12.7	-0.56
6	26	50.54	22.3	49.12	20.0	-1.42	10.8	-0.67
7	18	50.17	19.2	50.06	17.5	-0.11	11.2	-0.04
8	28	45.78	14.3	45.46	15.5	-0.32	6.7	-0.25
Total[a]	129	49.68	21.5	49.12	20.8	-0.56	12.9	-0.49

*$p<.05$

[a] Data were missing for 34 students.

- Students showed a decrease on the D.R.P. test. The trend was similar to that found citywide.

Attendance

The Model Developmental Program for Bilingual Education did not propose any objectives for attendance. OREA, however, finds attendance information to be significant in the evaluation of bilingual projects and is, therefore, reporting attendance rates.

The overall attendance rate for the project was 89.32 percent, based on 378 students.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

- Twenty-five percent of the 19 teachers in kindergarten through eighth grade will complete at least 6 college credits (3 last year and 3 this year) in appropriate courses.
- An additional 15 percent of the teachers will complete 3 college credits in appropriate courses.

The project provided tuition assistance to program teachers. During the 1990-91 school year, fourteen (75.0 percent) of the teachers completed more than three credits in bilingual education. During the 1991-92 school year, 17 of the teachers (89.5 percent) completed at least three more college credits in bilingual education. The project met both staff development objectives for ongoing education.

- Forty percent of the teacher trainees (not including those who achieved this criterion last year unless it is in a different content area) will achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction depending on which content area training they participated in.

The project did not develop the criterion-referenced test, therefore OREA was unable to evaluate the attainment of this objective.

- Fifty percent of the new teacher trainees will be able to utilize developmental bilingual instructional methodologies when working with target pupils.
- Fifty percent of the second year trainees to display further enhanced developmental instructional skills.

Teachers of participating students participated in a series of monthly and weekly activities sponsored by the bilingual district office. Workshops focused on Spanish and E.S.L. language activities as well as reading and literature in the dual language curriculum. A total of 13 workshops were open to all the teachers in the C.S.D. An average of three teachers from the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education attended these workshops.

The project distributed a Likert-type evaluation questionnaire to staff at the end of the school year and submitted a total of 13 completed questionnaires to OREA. All respondents rated the staff development activities as superior. Teachers felt that they had gained extensive knowledge from these activities and thought that these types of activities were extremely useful. The project met its two staff development objectives for new and second-year trainees.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT OUTCOMES

- Seventy percent of the parent participants will increase skills and knowledge in the areas within which they took instruction such as: E.S.L./S.S.L., native language arts, high school equivalence, computer learning, home-based remediation and enrichment for students, how to make instructional materials from household items, basic intermediate and advanced conversational English/Spanish for adults, and citizenship education.

The project offered a wide variety of activities on a weekly basis for parents of participating students. Attendance sheets for 26 meetings and events showed an average attendance of ten. Activities included E.S.L. and S.S.L. classes, craft workshops, alcohol-education meetings, parent volunteer training, test preparation workshops, and field trips. In addition, the project sponsored a college-oriented program at Mercy College, in which parents of participating students attended G.E.D. preparation courses and could opt to start a college education.

In order to assess parents' satisfaction and interest in the activities, the project distributed Likert-type surveys. OREA received a total of 20 completed surveys. These indicated that parents had gained extensive knowledge from the workshops, 70 percent thought that the workshops and activities had been useful, and 95 percent thought they had been very interesting. The project met its parental involvement objective for increased skill and knowledge.

- Fifteen percent of the parent participants to master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers.

During the 1991-92 school year, a total of 25 project parents volunteered to work in varied activities throughout the school. These included tutoring in reading, chaperoning field trips, helping organize and carry out school celebrations and activities, and recruiting new parents into the project. The project met its parental involvement objective.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Participating students in the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education showed academic progress at the end of the 1991-92 school year. Of the 392 students, 388 were promoted to the next grade. The LEP population improved in E.S.L., native language, and the major content areas as indicated by their performance on the LAB and the SABE. Although the EP population did not show any gains on citywide tests, those students performed similarly to EP students throughout the city. Overall, the EP population had lower scores on the ELE posttest than they did on the reading subtest of the Spanish LAB pretest. This may have been due, in part, to the small number of matched scores for EP students in Spanish reading.

Project services not only benefited the students academically, but also increased their awareness of their own and other cultures. Project staff also improved their teaching techniques after attending the project's weekly seminars. Parents benefited from the broad array of activities that the project offered throughout the year.

The program findings were consistent with the theoretical framework of a developmental bilingual educational program, except for the loss showed by the EP population in reading and mathematics. This decrease in scores, however, may be a citywide phenomenon rather than project-related.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Develop a criterion-referenced test to measure the staff development objective or request modification of the objective to make it possible for OREA to evaluate it in the future.
- Explore additional techniques to increase EP students' acquisition of skills in English reading, mathematics, and Spanish reading.

APPENDIX A

Selected Bibliography of Spanish Books
Dual Language Program
District 3
Compiled by Ruth A. Swinney

Bilingual Publications
Vendor # BIL 004000
Contract # 6209400

For teachers. Resource books:

"A la Sombra de un Verde Limón". Antología del cancionero tradicional argentino. (Comp. Paulina Movsichoff)

"A la Una Sale la Luna" Juegos tradicionales infantiles. (Comp. Paulina Movsichoff)

"Canciones de Nana y Desvelo" (Carmen Conde)

5/6/7 grade

"Arhuaco. Sierra Nevada" (Bengt Arne Runnerstrom) Documentary story about the indians of the Sierra Nevada in Colombia, written by a Danish anthropologist, under a grant from the Nicaragua Ministry of Culture. Great research source for a 5/6/7/8 class.

"Canciones de Nana y Desvelo" (Carmen Conde) Wonderful collection of poems. Won National prize for children's literature in Spain in 1987.

"Chaucha y Palito." (Maria Elena Walsh) A collection of five stories. Funny and imaginative, as all the stories of this author. Reading level 7th/8th grade . Fairly complicated sentence structure, difficult vocabulary.

"Cuentopos de Gulubu." (Maria Elena Walsh) Collection of short stories for children.. Fairly complicated sentence structure. The book can be read to 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade children. The images are very appealing to young children. Reading level 6th grade.

"Cuentos de Enredos y Travesuras"
"Como Surgieron Los Seres y las Cosas."
"Cuentos de Leyendas de Amor para Niños." These three books contain a wonderful collection of traditional children stories and myths from Latin America. The illustrations are beautiful. The books are an invaluable source of cultural enrichment for all those interested in learning about the Hispanic cultures. Reading level 5th/6th grade. Complicated sentence structure.
"Cuentos Populares Rusos" Beautiful collection of folktales from Russia. Fairly complicated language structure. 5/6/7 reading level.

"Cuentos y Leyendas de Guatemala". (Francisco Barnoya Galvez)

"Dailan Kifki." (Maria Elena Walsh) Charming story about an elephant. Complicated vocabulary and sentence structure. Reading level 7th/8th grade.

"El Regreso de McBroom" (Sid Fleischman) Three stories about a farmer. Very complicated sentence structure and vocabulary. Translated from English. Reading level 6/7.

"El Reino del Reves." (Maria Elena Walsh) Very clever and funny book of songs and poetry for older children. Reading level 5th/6th grade.

"El Topo." (William Mayne, illustrated by Nicola Bayley) Beautiful story with outstanding illustrations. Fairly sophisticated language, but on a 4/5 reading level.

"El Unicornio y el Mar." (Fiona Moodie) Wonderful story translated from German. Very artistic illustrations. Fairly easy sentence structure. Easy vocabulary. Reading level 4/5/6.

"El Viaje de Dos Niños Miskitos por el Rio Coco". Story incorporating the experiences of two European social workers during time spent with the Miskita indian communities in Nicaragua. Wonderfully illustrated book., A very important cultural contribution. A must for any upper grade classroom. Complex language. Reading level 5/6.

"Fabulas y Leyendas Americanas" (Ciro Alegria) Wonderful collection. Fairly complicated language. 6/7 reading level.

"Florian y el Tractor Max." (Binette Schroeder) Very creative story translated from German. Fairly complicated language. Reading level 5/6/7.

"Guerreros, Dioses y Espiritus" Outstanding illustrations. Reference book on Mexican myths. 6/7 reading level.

"Lison y el Agua Dormida" (Christian Bruel, Annie Galland, Anne Bozellec)Intricate story about a girl and her very vivid imagination. Complicated sentence structure. Difficult vocabulary. Translation of a French story. Reading level 5/6/7.

"Max y Morris" (Wilhelm Bulch). Beautifully illustrated story about two german boys. The illustrations are reproductions of original edition of book, published in 1870 in Germany. Translation from German. Complicated sentence structure. Poems have difficult vocabulary. Reading level 5/6

"Palomas Sobre el Mundo." v. I and II. (Ema Godoy) Collection of stories, legends, fables and myths. Reading level 5/6.

"Primitivos Relatos Contados Otra Vez. Heroes y Mitos Amazónicos." Although the language of these stories is complicated, they are a wonderful resource for any classroom.

"Ratatatam" (Binette Schroeder, Peter Nickl) - Beautifully illustrated story about a small locomotive and a little boy. Complicated sentence structure and vocabulary. Translation of a Swiss story. Reading level 5/6.

"Sirenita Cincuenta y Nueve." (Graciela Gonzalez de Tapia) - Beautifully illustrated Mexican tale about an adventure with a siren. Complicated sentence structure. Difficult vocabulary. Reading level 5/6

"Versos Tradicionales para Cebollitas." (Maria Elena Walsh) Wonderful collection of Argentinian folkloric poems. Reading level 5th/6th grade.

3rd and 4th grade

"Colección Cuentos Populares". Spanish translation of some very well known stories, and some unusual stories. Good vocabulary. Reading level 3/4. Some titles:

"Caperucita Roja"
"Los Tres Deseos"
"El Sastrecillo Valiente"
"La Hormiguita que Iba a Jerusalén"
"El Califa Cigüeña"

"Juanote y las Tres Bolsas de Or" (Adaptación de Jordi Jané) Lovely Catalan story about a boy trying to become very wise. Easy language structure. Reading level 3/4

"La Abeja Aragana" (Horacio Quiroga) Beautiful story by the mexican writer. easy language. 3/4 gr. reading level.

"Palomita de la Puna."
"Tutu Maramba."
"Un Chimpance."
"La Foca Loca." (Maria Elena Walsh) Four wonderfully imaginative books of poetry for young children. Easy vocabulary, fun reading. 3/4th grade reading level.
"Mientras Tim juega en el puerto" (Eduard Delgado, Francesc Rovira) Beautifully illustrated Spanish tale about a little boy and his adventures in the sea. Easy sentence structure and vocabulary. Reading level 3/4.

"Zoo Loco." (Maria Elena Walsh) Very funny book of limericks for young children.This book should be read to 2nd and 3rd graders. Reading level 3rd/4th grade.

Science/ Social studies

Colección Piñata. This series incorporates native Hispanic leyends and illustrations to explain different concepts. Very easy reading. Big print. Reading level 2/3. Books in this collection:

- Serie "El medio ambiente":
  - "El Agua"
  - "El Mar"
  - "El Universo"
- Serie "La Flora"
  - "Las Frutas"
  - "El Maiz"
- Serie"Las Artes"
  - "Sonidos y Ritmos"
  - "Los Titeres"
- Serie "Las Materias Primas"
  - "El Barro"
  - "La Lana"
  - "El Papel"
  - "La Seda"
  - "Tres Colorantes Prehispánicos"
  - "El Azúcar"
  - "El Chocolate"
- Serie "La Vida Social"
  - "El Campo y la Ciudad"
  - "El Mercado"
- Serie "Cuentos y Leyendas"
  - "Adivinanzas Indigenas"
- Serie "Nuestro Pais"
  - "La Zona del Silencio"

Kgn., 1st/2nd grade

"Castillos de arena"

"El escondite"
"El hada Dalia"
"El huerto de Dona Rosa"
"La noche mas oscura del mundo"
"La orquesta" "Luisa y el arco iris"
"Pedro aprende a nadar" (Sara Gerson) Stories by the Mexican author. Very easy reading, easy vocabulary, big print. Kgn, 1/2nd grade.

"El agua y sus maravillas" Wonderful collection of science books for young children. Reading level 1/2/3. Some of the titles:
"El mar y sus maravillas"
"El maravilloso mundo""El mundo de los arboles"
"El mundo del sonido"
"La vida de los animales"
"Las islas y sus maravillas"
"Las vidas de las plantas"
"Los rios y sus maravillas"
"Migraciones animales"
"Montanas y volcanes"

"El gato araña"
"El gato cangrejo"
"El gato elefante"
"El gato Loro"
"El gato oso polar" (Nicola Bayley) Wonderful books about imaginative cat who dreams about how life would be if he were another animal. Reading level 1/2

"El mejor novio del mundo"(Adaptación de Jose Sennell) Spanish version of a chinese folktale. Wonderfull illustrations. Easy language. Reading level 1/2.

"Un pasito y otro pasito" (Tomie de Paola) Charming story. Easy language. Big print. Ideal for beginning readers. Reading level 1/2

Colección "Los Traviesos" (Rose Impey) Translation from a British series. Funny. Very easy readers. Large print. Titles:
"El Monstruo del Cepillo de Dientes"
"El terror de la Casa"
"La fiera que Nunca Duerme"
"La reina de las Alubias"
"Un tipo Duro"

Science:

El Primer Libro de la Naturaleza. (The First Book of Nature)
This wonderful series of science books brings some very complicated concepts to the level of very young children. The language is very simple, sentence structure is on the level of the early elementary grades. The illustrations are beautiful. These are books that turn young readers on to science.
"El Agua" (The water)
"El Aire" (The Air)
"El Hormiguero" (The anthill)
"El Mosquito" (The fly)
"El Sapo" (The Frog)
"La Tierra" (The earth)

Enciclopedia de la naturaleza. Lovely series of science books for young children, in the early elementary grades. The language is easy, the illustrations are beautiful, and the concepts are easy to understand. Reading level 1/2. Great addition to a classroom library.

"Como son las Mariposas" (All about butterflies)
"Como son los arboles" (All about trees)
"Como son los Dinosaurios" (All about dinosaurs)
"Como son los Monos" (All about monkeys)

Santillana
Vendor # SAN 108. Contract # 6276400

1/2/3/4

"El Zoo Fantastico" Beautiful set of easy reading books for early grades, dealing with imaginary animals. Beautiful illustrations

"Benjamin Informacion" Set A, Set B. Set C. Excellent science resource sets. 2/3/4 reading level. An important addition to the library.

"Libros para jugar" Very easy collection of reading books. Reading level 1/2 Some of the titles:
"Cincuenta salva a un amigo"
"Cincuenta y el zorro"
"El elicoptero"
"El mejor de los perros"
"Era un Rey de cuento y otras rimas insfantiles"
"Mi abuelo y el volcan Rosa"
"Yo subía la escalera y otrras rimas infantiles"

"Catalina Albóndiga y Enrique Bribón" Nice and funny story. Language is simple.. Reading level 3/4

"El Mas Pequeño del Bosque" (Alfredo Castellon) Easy story about a dwarf. Illustrated by young children. Reading level 2/3

"Olga da Polga" Series of stories about a guinea pig who is also an actress. Translated from the French. Reading level 3/4/5

Attanasio & Associates
Vendor No. ATT0280
Contract No. 6298400
"Spanish Big Books." Funny and easy reading for early childhood grades. Each book is a complete story. Wonderful to develop language. Some titles:
"Abuelito, abuelito"
"Ahora No"
"Alto"
"Buenas Noches"
"Casas"
"Dragolia"
"Hugo"
"La Cena"
"La Familia de los Tigres"
"La Fiesta"
"La Rosa Hermosa"
"La Señora Lavandera"
"Los Animales de Don Vicencio"
"Ni por aquí ni por allá"
"Quién será mi mamá?

"Rosa y Gaston"
"Ven a Jugar"

Lectorum
Vendor No. LEC 00500
Contract No. 6247300

"Colección Imágenes y Palabras." Great books to develop language. Books in the set:

"Cosas que se Mueven"
"El Libro de la Naturaleza"
"La Vueltas al Mundo"
"Viajando por el Tiempo"

"Libros para Mirar" .
"Alegre y Triste"
"Contrarios"
"Grande y Pequeño"
"La Ropa que me Gusta"
"Primeras Palabras" All these books are great for Kgn. and 1st. grade children. They have very few words, and teachers can develop a lot of vocabulary with the illustrations

"Federico Garcia Lorca y los niños." Excellent autobiography of the poet, written specifically for children, including some of his most beautiful poems.

"Cristobal Colón."
"Alejandro Magno." Interesting biographies.

1/2/3/4 grade

"Por el mar de las Antillas" Nicolas Guillen. Wonderful poems for children.

El Libro de las Adivinanzas. Collecction of riddles. Excellent for developing language.

"El Mejor Regalo" Charming story. 3/4 reading level

"El Secuestro de la Bibliotecaria" Funny story. Difficult vocabulary and sentence structure. 3/4 reading level.

"El Otoño"
"El invierno"
"La primavera"
"El verano"
"El tigre"
"El panda"
"La nutria." Exciting colection of science/literature books. Children find the informatiion fascinating and the illustrations are outstanding.

"Representación Navideña." Good story for the Christmas holidays. Easy language.

"Sapo y Sepo Son Amigos" (Arnold Lobel) translation from English. Great story, and the first book in a series of stories about Sapo and Sepo. Excellent content. Easy language and sentence structure. Reading level 2/3.

"Viajo en Barco"

"Viajo en Avión"
"Viajo en Coche" Easy vocabulary, great illustrations. Information about transportation.

"El Sapo Distraido." Outstanding illustrations. Easy reading.

DDL BOOKS
6521 N.W. 87th Street
Miami, Florida, 33166

Vendor No. DDL 006 **Contract No. 6220500**

Colección "El Niño Quiere Saber." Excellent collection of books that combines science with reading. For elementary grades 3-6.

Colección "Punto Infantil." Very good books for early childhood.

Colección "Ventana Mágica." Clasic stories translasted into Spanish.

Colección "La Ciencia al Alcance de los Niños." Excellent science books. gr. 3-6.

APPENDIX B

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
BILINGUAL,MULTICULTURAL, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, ROOM 732
BROOKLYN, NY 11201
Phone: (718) 935-3790 FAX: (718) 935-5490

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Evaluating Programs
For Our Future Leaders
Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Programa: **Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education**
(Dual Language)

1	0	6
1	2	3

Month ☐☐ (4 5) Day ☐☐ (6 7)

Date: ______________________________

Instructions: Please complete the questions below with the number that reflect your opinion.

1. As a result of this workshop, How much did you learn about the topic covered?

   Nothing |___|___|___|___|___|___| A great deal
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   ☐ 8

2. Was the workshop useful?

   Not at all useful |___|___|___|___|___|___| Extremely useful
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   ☐ 9

3. Were there sufficient opportunities to ask questions and express ideas?

   Insufficient Opportunities |___|___|___|___|___|___| Extensive opportunities
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   ☐ 10

4. Was the workshop interesting?

   Not at all interesting |___|___|___|___|___|___| Very interesting
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   ☐ 11

5. Please indicate the type of information you would like to receive in future workshops?

   ______________________________ ☐ 12
   ______________________________ ☐ 13
   ______________________________ ☐ 14
   ______________________________ ☐ 15

6. Comments: ______________________________ ☐ 16
   ______________________________ ☐ 17
   ______________________________ ☐ 18
   ______________________________ ☐ 19

Thank you very much for your assistance.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
BILINGUAL,MULTICULTURAL, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, ROOM 732
BROOKLYN, NY 11201
Phone: (718) 935-3790 FAX: (718) 935-5490

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Evaluating Programs For Our Future Leaders
Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood

CUESTIONARIO PARA LOS PADRES

Programa: **Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education (Dual Language)**

1	0	6
1	2	3

Fecha: ________________________ Mes ☐☐ (4 5) Día ☐☐ (6 7)

Instrucciones: **Por favor indique su opinión acerca del taller en que acaba de participar. Marque el número que corresponde en el recuadro a la derecha.**

1. A consecuencia de este taller, ¿Cuánto aprendió usted sobre este tema?

   Muy poco |___|___|___|___|___| Mucho
   1 2 3 4 5 ☐ 8

2. ¿Le fue útil el taller?

   No fue útil |___|___|___|___|___| Fue muy útil
   1 2 3 4 5 ☐ 9

3. ¿Tuvo usted suficientes oportunidades para hacer preguntas?

   Ninguna oportunidad |___|___|___|___|___| Muchas oportunidades
   1 2 3 4 5 ☐ 10

4. ¿Fue interesante el taller?

   No fue interesante |___|___|___|___|___| Fue muy interesante
   1 2 3 4 5 ☐ 11

5. Por favor indique qué tipo de información desearía recibir en otros talleres.

   ____ ☐ 12
   ____ ☐ 13
   ____ ☐ 14
   ____ ☐ 15

6. Comentarios: ________________________________ ☐ 16
   ____ ☐ 17
   ____ ☐ 18
   ____ ☐ 19

Muchas gracias por su ayuda.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
BILINGUAL,MULTICULTURAL, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, ROOM 732
BROOKLYN, NY 11201
Phone: (718) 935-3790 FAX: (718) 935-5490

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Evaluating Programs
For Our Future Leaders
Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood

STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

Program: **Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education**
(Dual Language)

1	0	6
1	2	3

Date: ______________________ Month ☐☐ (4 5) Day ☐☐ (6 7)

If this is your first year in the Dual Language project, please put a (1) in the box ☐ 8

Instructions: Please complete the questions below with the number that reflect your opinion.

1. As a result of this year's staff development, how much have you learned about the topics covered?

   Nothing |___|___|___|___|___| A great deal ☐ 9
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Were the workshops useful?

   Not at all useful |___|___|___|___|___| Extremely useful ☐ 10
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Were there sufficient opportunities to ask questions and express ideas?

   Insufficient Opportunities |___|___|___|___|___| Extensive opportunities ☐ 11
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Were the workshops interesting?

   Not at all interesting |___|___|___|___|___| Very interesting ☐ 12
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Please indicate the type of information you would like to receive in future workshops.

   ____ ☐ 13

   ____ ☐ 14

   ____ ☐ 15

6. Comments: ______________________________________ ☐ 16

   ____ ☐ 17

   ____ ☐ 18

Thank you very much for your assistance.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
BILINGUAL,MULTICULTURAL, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, ROOM 732
BROOKLYN, NY 11201
Phone: (718) 935-3790 FAX: (718) 935-5490

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Evaluating Programs
For Our Future Leaders
Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood

CUESTIONARIO ACERCA DE LOS TALLERES PARA LOS MAESTROS(AS)

Programa: **Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education (Dual Language)**

1	0	6
1	2	3

Fecha: ______________________ Mes ☐☐ (4 5) Día ☐☐ (6 7)

Si éste es su primer año en el Programa de Dos Lenguas (Dual Language), por favor ponga un (1) en el recuadro a la derecha ☐ 8

Instrucciones: **Por favor indique su opinión acerca del taller en que acaba de participar. Marque el número que corresponde en el recuadro a la derecha.**

1. ¿Cuánto aprendió usted a consecuencia de los talleres de este año escolar?

   Muy poco |_1_|_2_|_3_|_4_|_5_| Mucho ☐ 9

2. ¿Qué tan útiles le fueron los talleres?

   No fueron útiles |_1_|_2_|_3_|_4_|_5_| Fueron muy útiles ☐ 10

3. ¿Tuvo usted suficientes oportunidades para hacer preguntas?

   Ninguna oportunidad |_1_|_2_|_3_|_4_|_5_| Muchas oportunidades ☐ 11

4. ¿Qué tan interesantes le parecieron los talleres?

   No fueron interesantes |_1_|_2_|_3_|_4_|_5_| Fueron muy interesantes ☐ 12

5. Por favor indique qué tipo de información desearía recibir en otros talleres.

   ______________________________ ☐ 13

   ______________________________ ☐ 14

   ______________________________ ☐ 15

6. Comentarios: ______________________________ ☐ 16

   ______________________________ ☐ 17

   ______________________________ ☐ 18

Muchas gracias por su ayuda.

APPENDIX C

Title VII Data Collection and Evaluation System

The Title VII Data Collection and Evaluation System enables project staff to report on the Title VII evaluation requirements in an accurate and comprehensive manner. The following list contains information that should be included along with the annual Title VII evaluation report.

Part I: Data Collection and Summary Plan

___ Section 1: Project Identification (p.I-1) ✓

___ Section 2: District and School Information (pp.I-2 through 4)

___ Section 3: Student Selection Information (pp. I-5 and 6)
- ___ Worksheet 3.1
- ___ Worksheet 3.2
- ___ Worksheet 3.3

___ Section 4: Staff Information (pp.I-9, 12 and 13)
- ___ Worksheet 4.1 ✓ needs some
- ___ Worksheet 4.2 ✓ "
- ___ Worksheet 4.3 ✓

___ Section 5: Instructional Program Information (pp.I-15, 18 through 21)
- ___ Worksheet 5.1 ✓
- ___ Worksheet 5.2 ✓
- ___ Worksheet 5.2a ✓
- ___ Worksheet 5.3 ✓
- ___ Worksheet 5.3a ✓
- ___ Worksheet 5.4 [illegible] needed

___ Section 6: Student Information and Non-test Data (pp.I-26 and 27)
- ___ Worksheet 6.1 ✓
- ___ Worksheet 6.2 N/A

___ Section 7: Test Data (pp.I-31, 32, 34, 35, 51, and 53)
- ___ Worksheet 7.1 N/A
- ___ Worksheet 7.2 (For use with "live" comparison group students only) N/A
- ___ Worksheet 7.3 N/A
- ___ Worksheet 7.4 (For use with nonstandardized, qualitative measures only) N/A

Worksheets 7.5 and 7.6 are not required by regulation
- ___ Worksheet 7.5 (For late pretest analysis only)
- ___ Worksheet 7.6 (For early posttest analysis only)

Part II: Data Summary Tables

__ Section 4: Staff Information (pp.II-1 through 11)

- __ Table 4.1 ✓
- __ Table 4.2 ✓
- __ Table 4.3 ✓
- __ Table 4.4 ✓
- __ Table 4.5 ✓
- __ Table 4.6 ✓
- __ Table 4.7 ✓
- __ Table 4.8 ✓
- __ Table 4.9 [illegible]
- __ Table 4.10 ✓
- __ Table 4.11 ✓
- __ Table 4.12 ✓
- __ Table 4.13 ✓

__ Section 5: Instructional Program Information (pp.II-12, 14, and 15)

***Note:** If you have completed worksheet 5.1 in Part I-Data Collection Plan, you will not need to complete tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 in this section.*

- __ Table 5.1
- __ Table 5.2
- __ Table 5.3

__ Section 6: Student Information and Non-test Data (pp.II-16 through p.II-19 and 21)

- __ Table 6.1 ✓
- __ Table 6.2 ✓
- __ Table 6.3 ✓
- __ Table 6.4 ✓
- __ Table 6.5 (For use with "live" comparison group students only) N/A
- ✓ Table III-4 (For use with Gap Reduction Design for reporting nontest data only)
- ✓ Table III-5 (For use with Gap Reduction Design for reporting nontest data only)

__ Section 7: Test Data (pp.II-22 through 27 and if necessary, pp. I-51 & I-53)

- __ Table 7.1 ✓
- __ Table 7.2 ✓

***Note:** The following tables are supplied as recommended alternatives for reporting data analysis and should be supplemented by other tables as necessary to describe additional analyses that have been conducted.*

- __ Table III-1 (For use with Non-Equivalent Comparison Group Design only)
- __ Table III-2 (For use with Non-Equivalent Comparison Group Design only)
- __ Table III-3 (For use with Grade Cohort Design only)
- __ Table III-5 (For use with non-test Gap Reduction data only)
- __ Table III-6 (For use with Gap Reduction Design only)

Developed by Evaluation Assistance Center-West, NMHU, Albuquerque, NM (4/92) from *Data Collection and Evaluation System*, US Depart. of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (1990).

Date Section Completed: 4/21/92

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

Section 1 contains descriptive information on this project. Please complete items 1-9.

1. Grant number: T003C00091

2. Type of project (check one):

Transitional Bilingual Education	
Special Alternative	
Developmental	X
Special Populations	

3. Years of project under this Title VII grant: 1 2 3 4 5

4. Name of project: DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM - P.S. 84/DUAL LANG. MIDDLE SCHOOL

5. School district: 3

Address: 300 WEST 96TH STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10025

6. Project director: RUTH A. SWINNEY

7. Phone number: (212) 678-2938/39

8. Title VII grant award to nearest dollar amount in current fiscal year: $198,904

9. Amount of Title VII support expended for evaluation in current fiscal year: 6,000

Date Section Completed: 4/21/92

SECTION 2: DISTRICT AND SCHOOL INFORMATION

Directions for Section 2-a: District Information.

Section 2-a contains information on district demographics. The information requested in questions 1-4 is required by the Title VII legislation.

1. Number of all children enrolled in programs conducted by the LEA (i.e., total public school enrollment) [7021(c)(2)(A)]:

Number of children	
Date data collected	

2. Number of limited English proficient (LEP) children enrolled in public and private schools in the district [7021(c)(2)(C)(i)]:

	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Number of LEP children	2,400	-
Date data collected	4/21/92	

3. Method used to determine the number of limited English proficient children enrolled in public and private schools [Leg. Sec. 7021(c)(2)(C)(ii)]:

PUBLIC: LAB TEST

PRIVATE:

4. The number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project [7021(c)(2)(F)]:

Limited English Proficient (LEP)	190
Language Minority English Proficient (EP)	130
English Language Background English Proficient (EP)	82

The information requested in questions 5-9 is not required by the Title VII legislation but is recommended to provide an accurate picture of the project setting.

5. Number of schools in district: 22

6. Type of geographic area (check all that apply):

Rural	
Suburban	
Urban	X

7. Student racial/ethnic distribution in district (in percents):

Native American/Eskimo/Aleuts	.07
Asian American/Pacific Islander	2.02
Hispanic	39.22
Black, other than Hispanic	47.44
White, other than Hispanic	1.26
TOTAL	100%
Date Data Collected	4/21/92

8. Percent of district K - 12 student population from low income families: 73.855

Date data collected: 4/21/92

Definition of low income (check all that apply):

School lunch program X

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) ________

Other ________

9. Number of student attendance days in current school year: 182

Directions for Section 2-b: School Information.

Section 2-b contains information on school demographics for those schools that participate in this Title VII project. This information is not required by the Title VII legislation but you should provide it if you feel additional information is necessary to describe your project more accurately. If you choose to complete 2-b, please fill out a separate form for each school in your district with Title VII project students. Answer only those questions that you think are applicable.

1. School name: P.S. 84

2. Type of geographic area:

Rural	
Suburban	
Urban	x

3. Number of children in the school: 800

4. Student racial/ethnic distribution (in percents):

Native American/Eskimo/Aleuts	0
Asian American/Pacific Islander	2.87
Hispanic	54.37
Black, other than Hispanic	33.00
White, other than Hispanic	9.75
TOTAL	100%

5. Percent of student population from low income families: 70%

Definition of low income (check all that apply):	
School lunch program	x
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	x
Other	

6. Number of limited English proficient children enrolled: 226

7. Number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project:

Limited English Proficient (LEP)	130
Language Minority EP	80
English Language Background EP	72

Directions for Section 2-b: School Information.

Section 2-b contains information on school demographics for those schools that participate in this Title VII project. This information is not required by the Title VII legislation but you should provide it if you feel additional information is necessary to describe your project more accurately. If you choose to complete 2-b, please fill out a separate form for each school in your district with Title VII project students. Answer only those questions that you think are applicable.

1. School name: Dual Language Middle School

2. Type of geographic area:

Rural	
Suburban	
Urban	x

3. Number of children in the school: 122

4. Student racial/ethnic distribution (in percents):

Native American/Eskimo/Aleuts	0
Asian American/Pacific Islander	0
Hispanic	95
Black, other than Hispanic	1
White, other than Hispanic	4
TOTAL	100%

5. Percent of student population from low income families: 90%

Definition of low income (check all that apply):	
School lunch program	x
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	x
Other	

6. Number of limited English proficient children enrolled: 60

7. Number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project:

Limited English Proficient (LEP)	60
Language Minority EP	50
English Language Background EP	10

Date Section Completed: ___________

SECTION 3: STUDENT SELECTION INFORMATION

Section 3 contains information regarding selection of Limited English Proficient (LEP) and English Proficient (EP) students for participation in this Title VII developmental program.

Requirements:

1. The Secretary reviews applications based, in part, on the extent to which the applicant has identified the needs of the LEP students to be served in the program, including the lack of proficiency of the LEP children in speaking, writing, and understanding the English language; and the degree of proficiency of the LEP children in their native language and in other courses or subjects of study [Reg. Sec. 501.31(a)(2)(i)-(ii)].

2. Reliability and objectivity of the method used to identify needs of the LEP students to be served in the program [Reg. SEc. 501.31(a)(2)].

Directions for Worksheet 3.1: LEP and EP Student Selection Procedures. Check the appropriate space(s) to indicate which assessment procedure(s) were used to determine selection into the Title VII developmental project for LEP and EP students. Only check selection criteria that are employed by your project.

Worksheet 3.1
LEP and EP Student Selection Procedures

Selection Procedures / Instruments	STUDENT CATEGORY	
	LEP	EP
a. Home Language Survey	x	x
b. English language proficiency		
(1) Oral	x	
(2) Reading	x	
(3) Writing		
c. Native (non-English) language proficiency		
(1) Oral		
(2) Reading		
(3) Writing		
d. Academic achievement in English in math, science or social studies		
e. Academic achievement in a non-English language in math, science or social studies		
f. Teacher recommendations	x	x
g. Parent recommendation	x	x
h. Other ______________________		

Directions for Worksheet 3.2 and 3.3: Selection Procedures and Criteria. For those selection procedures and instruments that you checked in Worksheet 3.1, provide the names of tests or procedures and selection scores or criteria for project entry. Also provide the type of score or unit (raw score, percentile, standard score, etc.) if applicable. Worksheet 3.2 is for LEP students. Worksheet 3.3 is for EP students.

Worksheet 3.2
Selection Procedures and Criteria for LEP Students

TEST OR PROCEDURE	Selection Scores or Criteria	Type Of Score or Unit (if applicable)
LAB	below stand	40%
	40% (percentile)	

Worksheet 3.3
Selection Procedures and Criteria for EP Students

TEST OR PROCEDURE	Selection Scores or Criteria	Type Of Score or Unit (if applicable)
NA	NA	NA

Staff Information Tables

Directions for Tables 4.1-4.13. Use Worksheet 4.1 — Staff Information, found in the Data Collection Plan — to fill in Tables 4.1 through 4.6. Use Worksheet 4.2 — Staff Training, also found in the Data Collection Plan — to fill in Tables 4.7 to 4.10. Use the teacher questionnaire found in Appendix A to fill in Tables 4.11 - 4.13.

For this section include the following staff only: Site administrators, all staff paid with Title VII funds, all teachers who work with Title VII students and staff other than teachers who work with Title VII students at least 50 percent of the time.

Directions for Table 4.1: Time on Title VII Project for Title VII Funded Staff. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), please indicate the total FTEs of staff whose salaries are funded by Title VII, and the actual number of such staff.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff including school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.1
Time on Title VII Project For Title VII Funded Staff

Time Commitment and Number of Staff	Title VII Funded			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. FTEs	2	0	N/A	2
2. Number of Staff	4	19	N/A	2

Please check staff listed in "Other" category.

___ Community Liaisons

___ Computer Technicians

___ Counselors

___ Instructional Specialists

___ Material developers

___ School psychologists

___ Resource teachers

___ Other school neighborhood worker & Bilingual secretary

Directions for Table 4.2: Time on Title VII Project for Non-Title VII Funded Staff. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g. administrator, teacher), please indicate the total FTEs of staff whose salaries are not funded by Title VII and the actual number of such staff.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff such as school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.2
Time on Title VII Project for Non-Title VII Funded Staff

Time Commitment and Number	Not Title VII Funded			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. FTE Staff	2	19	N/A	0
2. Number of Staff	4	19	0	11

Please check staff listed in "Other" category.

X Community Liaisons

__ Computer Technicians

X Counselors

X Instructional Specialists

__ Material developers

X School psychologists

X Resource teachers

__ Other Librarian, School neighborhood worker, Bilingual secretary

Directions for Table 4.3: Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII Project. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher) please indicate the number of staff paid by Title VII at different percentages of time.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff such as school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.3
Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII Project

Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII	STAFF			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Salary paid full time by Title VII	1	0	N/A	1
2. Salary paid at least half time but not full time by Title VII	1	0	N/A	1
3. Salary paid less than half time by Title VII Project but more than zero	0	0	N/A	0
4. Salary not paid at all by Title VII project	2	19	N/A	9

Please check staff listed in "Other" category.

X Community Liaisons

___ Computer Technicians

X Counselors

X Instructional Specialists

___ Material developers

X School psychologists

X Resource teachers

___ Other School neighborhood worker, Bilingual secretery, Librarian

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 4.4: Proficiency in Students' Native Language. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrators, teachers), indicate the number of staff with the following levels of proficiency in the native (non-English) languages of the students:

(1) **Native Speakers**

(2) **No Proficiency:** For non-native speakers, unable to speak, read, or write in student's native language;

(3) **Communicative Proficiency:** For non-native speakers, basic ability to communicate and interact socially in student's native language;

(4) **Teaching Proficiency:** For non-native speakers, ability to use LEP student's native language in teaching language arts or other academic subjects.

For each staff member indicate the highest level of proficiency only.

Table 4.4
Staff• Proficiency in Students' Native Language

Proficiency in Students' Native Language	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Native Speaker	3	16	N/A	——
2. No Proficiency	1	2	N/A	1
3. Communicative Proficiency	——	——	N/A	1
4. Teaching Proficiency	——	1	N/A	——

• All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 4.5: Proficiency in English. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrators, teachers), indicate the number of

(1) Native-English speakers.

Then indicate the number of non-native English speaking staff with the following levels of English proficiency:

(2) No Proficiency: Unable to speak, read, or write in English.

(3) Communicative Proficiency: Basic ability to communicate and interact socially in English,

(4) Teaching Proficiency: Able to use English in teaching language arts or other academic subjects.

For each staff member, indicate the highest level of proficiency only.

Table 4.5
Staff* Proficiency in English

Proficiency in English	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Native English Speakers	——	——	N/A	2
Non-native English Speakers 2. No Proficiency	——	——	N/A	——
3. Communicative Proficiency	——	——	N/A	——
4. Teaching Proficiency	4	19	N/A	——

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.6: Years Teaching Experience. For teachers and aides in the Title VII project, indicate total years of teaching experience (not necessarily with LEP students). Of this total, indicate number of years of experience with LEP students.

Table 4.6
Staff* Years of Teaching Experience

Number of Years Teaching Experience	Number of Staff With General Teaching-Experience		Number of Staff Having Taught LEP Students	
	Teachers	Aides	Teachers	Aides
1. 1 to 3 years	8	N/A	9	N/A
2. 4 to 6 years	5	N/A	5	N/A
3. 7 to 10 years	1	N/A	1	N/A
4. 11* years	5	N/A	4	N/A

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.7: Professional Certification. Enter number of staff in the Title VII project with the following certificates or endorsements: paraprofessional, classroom teacher, administrative, bilingual, ESL, other. You may enter more than one certificate or endorsement for each staff member if he or she has multiple certificates/endorsements.

Table 4.7
Staff* Professional Certification

Certificate or Endorsement	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Paraprofessional Certificate or Endorsement	0	0	0	0
2. Teaching Certificate or Endorsement (i.e. Elementary or Secondary)	0	2	0	0
3. Administrative Certificate or Endorsement	4	0	0	0
4. Bilingual Certificate or Endorsement	0	17	0	0
5. ESL Certificate or Endorsement	0	0	0	0
6. Other (Specify) ____ ____	0	0	0	0

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

66

Directions for Table 4.8: Academic Preparation. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrators, teachers), indicate the number of staff with the following degrees: High School Diploma, Associate Degree, Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Doctoral or Professional Degree. Report highest degree only for each staff member.

Table 4.8
Staff* Academic Preparation

Degree	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. High School Diploma	0	0	0	2
2. Associate Degree	0	0	0	0
3. Bachelor's Degree	0	8	0	0
4. Master's Degree	4	11	0	0
5. Doctoral or Professional Degree	3	0	0	0

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.9: State or Local Certification of Endorsements. Place a check in the appropriate space if your state, district, or other lawful authority provides bilingual or ESL certificates or endorsements.

Table 4.9
State or Local Certification or Endorsements

	Certificate	Endorsement
1. Bilingual		
2. ESL		

Directions for Table 4.10: Staff Training. Enter number of staff in the Title VII project with the areas of training indicated.

Table 4.10
Staff* Training

Training / Experience	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessionals	Other
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students	0	2	0	
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)	0	0	0	
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)	0	0	0	
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness	1	4	0	
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students	2	11	0	
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English	0	0	0	
7. Educational Assessment	0	0	0	
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)	0	0	0	
9. Other Training	0	0	0	
10. Peace Cor[illegible]	0	0	0	
11. Travel	0	0	0	
12. Other Experience	0	0	0	

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 4.11: Ability to use Training in Classroom by Type of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the three types listed: College coursework, inservice workshops and other. Then for each category, enter number of staff at each ability level.

The information required to complete Tables 4.11-4.13 can be found in the Staff Questionnaire.

Table 4.11
Ability to Use Training in Classroom by Types of Training

Type of Training	Number of Staff	Ability to Use Training in Classrooms			
		0	1	2	3
College Coursework	23				23
Inservice Workshops	23				23
Other					

Directions for Table 4.12: Ability to use Training in Classroom by Area of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the areas listed. Then for each area of training, enter number of staff at each ability level.

Table 4.12
Ability to Use Training in Classroom by Areas of Training

Area of Training	Number of Staff	Ability to Use Training in Classrooms			
		0	1	2	3
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students	22				22
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)	23				23
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)	23				23
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness	23				23
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students	16				16
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English	23				23
7. Educational Assessment	23				23
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)	23				23
9. Other					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 4.13: Type of Training by Area of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the areas listed. Then for each area of training, enter number of staff with each type of training.

Table 4.13
Type of Training by Area of Training

Area of Training	Number of Staff	Type of Training		
		College Coursework	Inservice Workshop	Other
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students	22		22	
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)	23		23	
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)	23		23	
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness	23		23	
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students	23	23		
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English	16		16	
7. Educational Assessment	23		23	
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)	23		23	
9. Other				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section 5: Instructional Program Information

Instructional Program Information Tables

Please note that if you have completed Worksheet 5.1 in the Data Collection Plan, you will not need to complete Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 in the Data Summary Plan. Worksheet 5.1 already summarizes program information.

Directions for Table 5.1: Average Percent Instructional Time by Language and Subject Area for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students. Table 5.1 shows the average percent instruction by language for each grade averaged across all instructional groups and schools. Indicate average percent instruction per typical full school week.

In order to complete Table 5.1, refer to Worksheet 5.2 of the Data Collection Plan. The average percent entered in Table 5.1 will be weighted by the number of students in each of the instructional groups appearing in Worksheet 5.1. To calculate a weighted average for percent instruction per typical school week through English for all instructional groups in a given grade for a given subject area, refer to Worksheet 5.2 and

1) Multiply the number of students in an instructional group by the percent instruction through the English language;
2) Sum the products of Step 1 for all instructional groups in a given grade;
3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students in this grade to get the weighted average.

Repeat these calculations to arrive at (1) the weighted average percent instruction through the native (non-English) language, and (2) the weighted average percent regular classroom instruction. An example is provided on page 13.

Grade Level: ______________________

Table 5.1
Average Percent Instructional Time by Language and Subject Area for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

SUBJECT AREAS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR LEP STUDENTS		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
	Through English	Through The Native Language	
Reading			
English Language Arts			
Native (non-English) Language Arts			
Math			
Social/Studies			
Science			
Average Percent			

In this example for Grade 5 in Math, the 63 percent shown in the column for English instruction for LEP students is derived by following these steps:

(1) Multiply the number of students in each instructional group by the percent instruction through the English language;

10 x 50 = 500
20 x 60 = 1200
30 x 70 = 2100

(2) Sum the products of Step 1;

500
1200
2100
3800

(3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students to get the weighted average

3800/60 = 63%

The figure 63 percent appearing on the worksheet for Table 5.1 would be carried over to Table 5.1 and entered in the "box" that corresponds to Math instruction designed for LEP students through English; 18 percent to the "box" that corresponds to math instruction designed for LEP students through the native language; and 18 percent to the "box" that corresponds to math instruction in regular classroom instruction.

Grade Level: 5

Subject Area: Math

Worksheet for Table 5.1 (Sample) Percent Instructional Time for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR LEP STUDENTS		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
		Through English	Through The Native Language	
Group 1	10	50%	40%	10%
Group 2	20	60%	20%	20%
Group 3	30	70%	10%	20%
Group 4				
Group 5				
Group 6				
Average Percent	XXXXXXXX	63%	18%	18%

Directions for Table 5.2: Average percent Instruction by Language and Subject Area for English Proficient (EP) Students. Table 5.2 shows the percent instruction by language for each grade averaged across all instructional groups and schools. Indicate percent instruction per typical full school week.

In order to complete Table 5.2, refer to Worksheet 5.3 of the Data Collection Plan. The average percent entered in Table 5.2 will be weighted by the number of students in each instructional group appearing in Worksheet 5.3. To calculate the weighted average percent instruction per typical school week through English for all instructional groups in a given grade for a given subject area, refer to Worksheet 5.3 and

1) Multiply the number of students in each instructional group by the percent instruction through English;

2) Sum the products of Step 1 for all instructional groups in a given grade;

3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students in this grade to get the weighted average.

Repeat these calculations to arrive at the average percent instruction through the non-English Language.

Grade Level: ______________________

Table 5.2
Average Percent Instruction by Language and Subject Area for English Proficient (EP) Students

SUBJECT AREAS	LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION INSTRUCTION FOR EP STUDENTS	
	Through English	Through the Non-English Language
Reading		
English Language Arts		
Native (non-English) Language Arts		
Math		
Social Studies		
Science		
Average Percent		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 5.3: Hours Per Week Instruction by Student's Language Proficiency and Subject Area. Table 5.3 shows the number of hours per week of instruction in different subject areas for both English Proficiency (EP) and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Refer to Worksheet 5.2a in completing Table 5.3 for LEP students, and refer to Worksheet 5.3a in completing Table 5.3 for EP students. The hours per week entered in Table 5.3 should be the average across all instructional groups. These hours should be a weighted average depending on the number of students per instructional group, as for Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Grade Level: ____________________

Table 5.3
Hours Per Week Instruction By Student's Language Proficiency and Subject Area

Subject Areas	Student Language Proficiency	
	Limited English Proficient (LEP)	English Proficient Students (EP)
Reading		
English Language Arts		
Native (non-English) Language Arts		
Math		
Social Studies		
Science		

Section 6: Student Information and Non-Test Data

Student Information Tables

Directions for Tables 6.1 - 6.4. Use Worksheet 6.1, Student Information and Non-Test Data to fill in these tables.

Directions for Table 6.1: Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Grade. For each grade level represented in the Title VII project, list the number of Limited-English-Proficient students, the number of English proficient students, and the total number of students. Sum across schools as necessary to compile the information for each grade.

Table 6.1
Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Grade

Grade	Proficiency		Total Students
	Limited English Proficient	English Proficient	
K	24	26	50
1	32	19	51
2	22	26	48
3	13	25	38
4	13	19	32
5	9	22	31
6	13	37	50
7	15	27	42
8	17	33	50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 6.2: Number of Title VII Students Eligible for Free Lunch by Grade. For each grade level represented in the project, list the total number of limited English Proficient students and English proficient students who are eligible for free lunch. In the last column indicate the total number of students eligible for free lunch. Sum across schools as necessary to compile the information for each grade.

Table 6.2
Number of Title VII Students Eligible for Free Lunch by Grade

Grade	Proficiency		Total Students
	Limited English Proficient	English Proficient	
K	20	17	37
1	19	7	26
2	15	10	25
3	10	14	24
4	4	10	14
5	8	6	14
6	10	26	36
7	15	27	42
8	0	0	0.

Directions for Table 6.3: Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Language Group. For each language group represented in the project (besides English Language Background Students) list the number of Limited-English Proficient students, the number of English proficient students and the total number of students. Sum across project grades and schools as necessary to compile the information for each language group.

Table 6.3
Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Language Group

Language Group	Proficiency		Total Students
	Limited English Proficient	English Proficient	
SPANISH	117	134	251
PORTUGUESE	1	1	2

Directions for Table 6.4: Non-Test Data Summary for Project Students. Use Worksheet 6.1 to complete this table.

The column numbers for the table correspond to the column numbers on the data worksheet. Transfer total numbers from Worksheet 6.1.

To calculate a column total, sum the numbers in each column. To calculate a column average, divide the column total by the total number of project students. Multiplying the averages by 100 will give a percent.

Table 6.4: Non-Test Data Summary on Project Students

GRADE	Number Of Students Currently In Project	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Number Of Dropouts	Number Referred And Placed In		(12) Number Enrolled in Postsecondary Education	(13) Number Participating at least 100 days	(14) Total Number of Days Attended	(15) Total Number of Days Enrolled
					(10) Special Education	(11) Gifted or Talented				
K	50	0	0	0				50	7006	9000
1	51	0	0	0				51	6690	9180
2	48	0	1	0				48	7135	8640
3	38	0	0	0				38	6574	6840
4	32	0	1	0				32	5458	5760
5	31	0	1	0				31	5318	5580
6	50	0	2	0				50	7913	9000
7	42	0	0	0				42	6951	7560
8	50	0	0	0				50	7998	9000
Project Total:	392	0	5	0	0	0	N/A	392	61,043	70,56
Project Average:	XXXXXXXXXXX		1.28%						155.72	18

Date: 8/92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 6.5: Non-Test Data Summary for Comparison Students. Use worksheet 6.2 in the Data Collection Plan to fill in this table.

This table is recommended for comparison group students. The composition of the comparison group will differ depending on which analysis you have selected.

The column numbers for the tables correspond to the column numbers on the data worksheets. Transfer total numbers from the Non-Test Data Worksheet.

To calculate a column total, sum the numbers in each column. To calculate a column average, divide the column total by the total number of project students. Multiplying the averages by 100 will give a percent.

Table 6.5: Non-Test Data Summary for Comparison Students

GRADE	Students Currently In Comparison Group	(7) Attended School Prior to Entry into Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Number Of Dropouts	Number Referred And Placed In		(12) Number Enrolled in Postsecondary Education	(13) Number Participating At Least 100 Days	(14) Total Number of Days Attended	(15) Total Number of Days Enrolled
					(10) Special Education	(11) Gifted or Talented				
Comparison Total:										
Comparison Average:	XXXXXXXXX									

Date: ______________ N/A

Non-Test Data Analysis Tables

All tables from III-1 through III-6 are drawn from the Data Analysis Plan, Part III, of the DAta Collection and Evaluation System. The Data Analysis Plan describes three models that meet evaluation regulations for Title VII: the Non-Equivalent Comparison Group Design, the Grade Cohort Design, and the Gap Reduction Design. Each project may select any one of these three evaluation designs in conducting their data analysis.

Tables III-4 and III-5 are for reporting non-test data with the Gap reduction Design and are included on the following page for reference. Note that only projects having selected to use the Gap Reduction Design in their data analysis should use these tables. Projects selecting either of the other evaluation models should use tables that are appropriate for their design. Tables III-1 through III-3 and III-6 are for reporting test data and are discussed in the section which follows.

GAP REDUCTION DESIGN

Table III-4
Non-Test Gap Reduction Data Summary by Grade

Grade: ______________________

MEASURE	PRE GAP	POST GAP	AMOUNT GAP REDUCTION	PERCENT GAP REDUCTION
1. Grade Retention				
2. Dropout Rate				
3. Referral to and Placement in Special Education Programs				
4. Referral to and Placement in Gifted and Talented Programs				
5. Enrollment in Post-Secondary Institutions				
6. Attendance	24,28	not available		
7. Other ______________				

Table III-5 N/A
Non-Test Gap Reduction Data Summary by Project

MEASURE	PRE GAP	POST GAP	AMOUNT GAP REDUCTION	PERCENT GAP REDUCTION
1. Grade Retention				
2. Dropout Rate				
3. Referral to and Placement in Special Education Programs				
4. Referral to and Placement in Gifted and Talented Programs				
5. Enrollment in Post-Secondary Institutions				
6. Attendance				
7. Other ______________				

Section 7: Test Data

Student Information Tables

Directions for Tables 7.1 and 7.2. Number of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Title VII Students by Years in Project and Grade. For each grade level represented in the Title VII project, list the number of students who have spent one year in the project, the number of students who have spent two years in the project, etc. In the last column enter the total number of students at each grade level. Sum across schools as necessary to compile the information for each grade.

Table 7.1
Number of Limited English Proficient Title VII Students by Years in Project and Grade

Grade	Years In Project						Total Students
	1	2	3	4	5	5+	
K	24						24
1	10	21					31*
2	7	7	7				21*
3	4	3	2	4			13
4	1	2	2	3	5		13
5	2	1	0	2	1	2	8*
6	8	1	0	1	1	1	12*
7	0	15					15
8	0	2	15				17

* data unreported for 1 student.

Table 7.2
Number of English Proficient Title VII Students by Years in Project and Grade

Grade	Years In Project						Total Students
	1	2	3	4	5	5+	
K	25						25*
1	6	12	1				19
2	8	6	11				25*
3	1	2	10	12			25
4	1	2	3	7	6		19
5	0	5	3	0	5	8	21*
6	17	1	3	2	1	11	35**
7	0	25	0	0	0	0	25**
8	1	3	29				33

* data unreported for 1 student
** data unreported for 2 students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Test Data Analysis Tables

All tables from III-1 through III-6 are selected from the Data Analysis Plan, Part III, of the Data Collection and Evaluation System. The Data Analysis Plan describes three models that meet evaluation regulations for Title VII: the Non-Equivalent Comparison Group Design, the Grade Cohort Design, and the Gap Reduction Design. Each project may select any one of these three evaluation designs in conducting their data analysis.

Tables III-1 through III-3 and III-6 are for reporting test data with these evaluation designs. The different tables are linked to the evaluation designs in the following manner:

Design	Table
Non-Equivalent Comparison Group Design	III-1 III-2
Grade Cohort Design	III-3
Gap Reduction Design	III-6

These tables are supplied as recommended alternatives for reporting the data analysis and should be supplemented by other tables as necessary to describe additional analyses that have been conducted.

NON-EQUIVALENT COMPARISON GROUP DESIGN

Table III-1

Pre- and Posttest Standard Score Means and
Standard Deviations of Title VII and Comparison
Group LEP and EP Students on the ABC Test

English Proficiency	Treatment Group	Pretest			Posttest		
		n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
LEP	Title VII	___	_____	___	___	_____	___
	Non-Title VII	___	_____	___	___	_____	___
EP	Title VII	___	_____	___	___	_____	___
	Non-Title VII	___	_____	___	___	_____	___

NON-EQUIVALENT COMPARISON GROUP DESIGN

Table III-2

Pre- and Posttest Standard Score Means and Standard Deviations of Title VII and Non-Title VII Groups on the ABC Test for Beginning and Intermediate Level Students in English Proficiency

Treatment Group	English Proficiency	Pretest			Posttest		
		n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Title VII	Beginning	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Intermediate	___	___	___	___	___	___
Non-Title VII	Beginning	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Intermediate	___	___	___	___	___	___

GRADE-COHORT DESIGN

TABLE III-3

Standard means and Standard Deviations of Title VII and Comparison Group LEP Students in Grade 6 with Varying Years of Program Participation by Academic Year on the ABC Test

				Years of Program Participation in Title VII								
	Comparison Group			One			Two			Three		
Academic Year (Cohort)	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Total	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GAP REDUCTION DESIGN

Table III-6

Gap Reduction Analysis Test Summary by Grade

(1)	PROJECT				COMPARISON				(6)
	(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		
	PRE		POST		PRE		POST		GAP REDUCTION
GRADE	M_____*	SD**	M_____*	SD	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	

* Enter Mean or Median, depending on which value is used.

** SD = Standard Deviation. The Project Group's SD is not entered if the Median is used for the Project Group.

Worksheet 4.1

Staff Information

STAFF I.D.#	(1) POSITION	(2) FTE ON PROJECT	(3) PERCENT OF SALARY PAID BY TITLE VII	(4) PROFICIENCY IN STUDENT'S NATIVE (NON-ENGLISH) LANGUAGE	(5) PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH	(6) YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	(7) YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE WITH LEP STUDENTS
451876	A	[illegible]	FT 50%	NS	TP	11+	11+
309397	A	[illegible]	ZR	LP	TP		
478704	A		100%	NS	TP	11+	11+
463774	A		ZR	NS	TP	11+	11+
655196	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
634746	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	4-6	4-6
663646	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
485275	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	11+	11+
643466	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	4-6	4-6
448905	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	11+	11+
604267	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	4-6	4-6
623780	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	4-6	4-6
657609	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
609849	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	7-10	7-10
460261	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	TP	TP	11+	11+
499987	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	11+	11+
433396	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NP		11+	1-3
646444	T	1.0 FTE	FT 100%	NS	TO	4-6	4-6
677403	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NP	TP	1-3	1-3
673256	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
674928	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
654049	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	4-6	4-6
671315	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
654063	T	1.0 FTE	ZR	NS	TP	1-3	1-3
N/A	O	1.0	100%	CP	NS	N/A	N/A
N/A	O	1.0	50%	NonP	NS	N/A	N/A

Worksheet 4.2
Staff Training

			MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY					
STAFF I.D.#	(8) PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION OR ENDORSEMENT	(9) ACADEMIC PREPARATION	(10) AA	(11) BA	(12) MA	(13) DOCTORATE OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL DEGREE	(14) TRAINING RELATED TO LANGUAGE-MINORITY EDUCATION	(15) NON-ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE RELATED TO LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION
451876	A	MA			14	14	73	73
309397	A	MA			16	64		
478704	B	MA			40	40	73	73
463774	B	MA			30	35	73	73
655196	B	MA			40	NONE	73	73
634746	B	MA			35	53	73	73
663646	B	MA			32	35	73	73
485275	B	MA			35	40	73	73
643466	B	MA			9	35	73	73
448905	B	MA			36	40	73	73
604267	B	MA			22	35	73	73
623780	B	MA			10	NONE	73	73
657609	B	BA			10	NONE	73	73
609849	B	BA			32	NONE	73	73
460261	B	DD			10	7	x 73	73
499987	B	MA			39	39	73	73
433396	T	MA			34	51	73	73
646444	B	MA			16	16	73	73
671315	B	BA			6	NONE	73	73
654063	B	BA				NONE	73	73

Worksheet 4.2
Staff Training

			MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY					
STAFF I.D.#	(8) PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION OR ENDORSEMENT	(9) ACADEMIC PREPARATION	(10) AA	(11) BA	(12) MA	(13) DOCTORATE OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL DEGREE	(14) TRAINING RELATED TO LANGUAGE-MINORITY EDUCATION	(15) NON-ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE RELATED TO LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION
478704	B	MA		39	39		72	
499987	B	MA		39	39		72	
433396	T	MA		34	51		69	
677403	T	BA		9			69	
673256	B	BA		31			72	
674928	B	BA		25			72	
654049	B	BA		6			72	
348700	T	MA		35	49		72 [illegible]	

Note

In columns 8 and 9, place the appropriate letters from the preceding key.
In columns 10-15, place the appropriate numbers from the preceding key.

Directions for Worksheet 4.3: Staff Information Addendum. In this worksheet staff refers to staff, other than teachers, who spend less than 50 percent of their time with Title VII students. Please indicate number of other staff working with Title VII students. Leave blank if not applicable.

Worksheet 4.3
Staff Information Addendum

Position	Number
School Psychologist	1
Counselor	2
Instructional Specialist	1
Community Liaison	1
Computer Technician	
Materials Developer	
Resource Teacher	3
Other LIBRARIAN	

90

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level K

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
MATH	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per-week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 1

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	33	50	50	
	EP	18	50	50	
MATH	LEP	33	50	50	
	EP	18	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	33	50	50	
	EP	18	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	33	50	50	
	EP	18	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	33	50	50	
	EP	18	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 2

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week
			Through Native Language	Through English	In Each Subject
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
MATH	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	25	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

93

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 3

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	30	50	50	
MATH	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	30	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	30	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	30	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	30	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 4

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	17	50	50	
MATH	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	17	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	17	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	17	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	17	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 5

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	21	50	50	
MATH	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	21	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	21	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	21	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	10	50	50	
	EP	21	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

96

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 6

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
LANGUAGE ARTS	LEP	11	50	50	
	EP	24	50	50	
MATH	LEP	11	50	50	
	EP	24	50	50	
SCIENCE	LEP	11	50	50	
	EP	24	50	50	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	11	50	50	
	EP	24	50	50	
ART MUSIC GYM	LEP	11	50	50	
	EP	24	50	50	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : LANGUAGE ARTS (READING, WRITING)

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 6TH/MIDDLE SCHOOL

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction Through Native Language	Percent Instruction Through English	Hours Per Week In Each Subject
SCIENCE	LEP	7	33%	67%	4
	EP	15	33%	67%	
MATH	LEP	7	0%	100%	5
	EP	15	0%	100%	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP	7	33%	67%	4
	EP	15	33%	67%	
LITERATURE	LEP	7	67%	33%	5
	EP	15	33%	67%	
ART	LEP	7	0%	100%	3
	EP	15	0%	100%	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : ____________________

____

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 7

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
SCIENCE	LEP		33%	67%	4
	EP		33%	67%	
MATH	LEP		0%	100%	5
	EP		0%	100%	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP		33%	67%	4
	EP		33%	67%	
LITERATURE	LEP		67%	33%	5
	EP		33%	67%	
ART	LEP		0%	100%	3
	EP		0%	100%	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : ____________________

____

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 8

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
SCIENCE	LEP		33%	67%	4
	EP		33%	67%	
MATH	LEP		0%	100%	5
	EP		0%	100%	
SOCIAL STUDIES	LEP		33%	67%	4
	EP		33%	67%	
LITERATURE	LEP		67%	33%	5
	EP		33%	67%	
ART	LEP		0%	100%	3
	EP		0%	100%	

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable) : ______________________

____

Directions for Worksheet 5.2: Percent Instructional Time for LEP Students. For subject areas listed below indicate percent of instructional time per typical full school week. Percent instructional time for each row (or group) should total 100 percent. Subject areas include, as appropriate to the grade level, Reading, English Language Arts, Native (non-English) Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science. Complete a separate worksheet for each grade level and subject area across schools.

Grade Level MIDDLE SCHOOL 6TH Subject Area MATH

Subject Areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella if applicable ______

Worksheet 5.2
Percent Instructional Time for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR LEP STUDENTS		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
		Through English	Through The Native Language	
Group 1	7	100		ONLY
Group 2				
Group 3				
Group 4				
Group 5				
Group 6				

Directions for Worksheet 5.2a: Hours Per Week Instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students. Please briefly describe the basis for instructional grouping that is reported in Worksheet 5.1 (e.g., language proficiency, academic achievement level, or other) and the hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Worksheet 5.2a
Hours Per Week Instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

	Basis For Grouping	Hours Per Week Spent in This Subject Area For Each Group
Group 1:	BY ABILITY	5
Group 2:		
Group 3:		
Group 4:		
Group 5:		
Group 6:		

Directions for Worksheet 5.3: Percent Instructional Time for English Proficient Students. For each subject area indicate percent of instructional time per typical full school week. Percent instructional time for each row should total 100 percent. Subject areas include as appropriate to the grade level. English Language Arts. Native (non-English) Language Arts. Math, Social Studies, and Sciences. Complete a separate worksheet for each grade level and subject area across schools.

Grade Level ________ Subject Area ____

Subject Areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella if applicable ____________________

Worksheet 5.3
Percent Instructional Time for English Proficient (EP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION FOR EP STUDENTS	
		Through English	Through the Non-English Language
Group 1		NA	
Group 2		NA	
Group 3		NA	
Group 4		NA	
Group 5		NA	
Group 6			

Directions for Worksheet 5.3a: Hours Per Week Instruction For English Proficient (EP) Students. Please briefly describe the basis for instructional grouping that is reported in Worksheet 5.1 (e.g., language proficiency, academic achievement level, or other) and the hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Worksheet 5.3a
Hours Per Week Instruction for English Proficient (EP) Students

Basis For Grouping		Hours Per Week Spent in This Subject Area For Each Group
Group 1:	NA	
Group 2:	NA	
Group 3:		
Group 4:		
Group 5:		
Group 6:		

Directions for Worksheet 5.4: Instructional Program Information. For each subject area reported in Worksheet 5.1 or 5.2 and 5.3, describe instructional activities, methods, or techniques; and pedagogical materials. For those projects that used Worksheets 5.2 and 5.3 please describe instructional features and materials for all groups within each project grade level. However, report separate information for groups shown on Worksheet 5.2 and 5.3 only when activities and materials are different for each group. Be as brief as possible. Consult with lead teachers as necessary to complete this worksheet. Appendix B lists and defines a number instructional approaches. Projects may wish to draw upon these approaches in describing their own instructional activities, if applicable. Since not all possible instructional approaches are contained in this list, projects should list and define any other approaches being used.

Worksheet 5.4
Instructional Program Information

Date: 4/21/92

Grade Level: K-7

Subject Area: ______

Instructional Group (if applicable): ______

Activities, Methods and/or Techniques

SEE ATTACHED INFORMATION

add I 20 chart

Worksheet 5.4
Pedagogical Method & Techniques Information

Staff ID #	Primary Pedagogical Method Used	Primary Pedagogical Technique Used	Average Percent of School Day Spent on Bilingual Education: Individual Planning	Peer Consultation	Teaching	Other	Total 100%
655196	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		[illegible]
634746	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		[illegible]
663646	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		[illegible]
485275	2	5/17					
643466	2	5/17					
448905	2	5/17					
604267	2	5/17					
623780	2	5/17					
657609	2	5/17					
609849	2	5/17					
460261	2	5/17					
499987	2	5/17					
433396	2	5/17					
646444	2	5/17					
671315	2	5/17					
654063	2	5/17					
478704	2	5/17					
499987	2	5/17					
433396	2	5/17					
677403	2	5/17					
673256	2	5/17					

674928	2	5/17	103	103	[illegible]		
654049	2	5/17					
348700	2	5/17	↓	↓	↓		1

Worksheet 5.4
Instructional Program Information

(Continued)

Materials (list materials by name and publisher when possible)

Elementary:

See attached bibliography

Intermediate:

See attached bibliography

Secondary:

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 6th-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
229341508	11/24/79	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	149	180
230044489	07/01/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
230044612	04/03/80	H		E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
230108151	07/28/80	H		N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
236035002	09/27/79	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
236242970	10/04/79	H		E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
237509930	12/19/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
238880330	05/19/80	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
241305150	05/31/79	H	Spanish	N	7	Y	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
245128814	02/03/79	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	131	180
248154692	12/07/79	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
250900529	03/12/79	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
251028464	10/09/79	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	13	2,033.00	2,340.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 7th-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
226111714	103178	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
227790482	070979	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
227895042	050779		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
227895075	122079		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
227895158	011779		Spanish	E	10	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
228037675	120578	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	161	180
228122495	050379	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
228122586	011779	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
228226276	121879	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
228226284	061779	4	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
228410791	080579		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
228410858	070879		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	147	180
228410981	102579		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
228411211	012179		Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
228411237	042379		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
228413936	042179	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
228537650	100379		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
229499538	022979		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	79	180
229861778	080979		Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
229905351	010878		Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
230041816	101579	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
233496041	031979	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
236046223	020379	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
237496625	040879	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
244082103	042078	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	80	180

247963127	081578	H	Spanish	E	10	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
247963135	101678	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	27	4,466.00	4,860.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 7th-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS.	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
227701885	08/20/78	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
228404141	08/18/78	H	Spanish	E	11	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	153	180
229322334	09/26/79	H	Spanish	E	10	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
229862461	01/20/78		Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	137	180
230044158	10/30/79	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
230048704	12/18/79	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
233168848	05/10/79	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
236037701	09/19/79	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
237509922	09/18/79	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
241308808	01/29/79	H	Spanish	E	10	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	131	180
241308949	09/29/79	H	Spanish	E	12	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
241309731	10/09/79	H	Spanish	E	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	158	180
247061328	10/19/78	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
247101165	10/25/79	H	Spanish	E	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
248176349	10/04/79	H	Spanish	E	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	0	2,485.00	2,700.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 8th-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS.	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
219092319	04/09/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
219092335	08/06/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
219416617	06/20/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	157	180
219448149	10/14/77	H	Spanish	N	9		N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
219448156	10/14/77	H	AP	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	152	180
221500010	01/28/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	158	180
221500804	05/04/78		Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
221500978	06/13/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	189	180
224863738	12/01/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
224871038	02/10/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
225146158	02/02/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
225155373	01/26/78		Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	97	180
225214089	09/14/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
225753623	03/05/78	4	EN	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
225951102	12/28/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
225951110	02/13/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
225951201	11/09/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
225951227	08/30/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
225951367	09/04/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
225951383	04/08/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	161	180
227384799	09/19/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
227579554	08/19/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
227703642	10/17/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
227704699	01/27/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
227790508	05/01/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180

228037891	11/07/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
228404638	02/25/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
229498845	07/07/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
229873090	04/01/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	167	180
231805193	02/03/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	158	180
234964302	12/13/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
241308972	01/01/78	4	EN	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
257542774	08/19/78		Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	138	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	33	5,561.00	5,940.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 8th-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS'	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
221500325	04/23/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
221500465	08/20/77		Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	134	180
221501059	11/19/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
224693457	07/20/77	H	Spanish	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
225154848	05/20/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	167	180
225155514	04/16/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	152	180
226094142	03/23/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
227894870	03/10/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
228060950	09/17/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	154	180
228404083	08/28/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
229631536	02/04/77	H	Spanish	N	8	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	130	180
229673256	03/13/77	H	EN	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
229673637	03/25/76	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	156	180
231805110	11/09/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
234746089	01/16/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
237491873	05/29/78	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
243194214	07/13/77	H	Spanish	N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	167	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	17	2,599	3,060

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: Kindergarten-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
243166584	10/08/86	B	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
243166592	11/07/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
243166600	12/09/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	142	180
243166733	08/07/86			N						N/A	X		180
243166741	12/09/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
243166758	02/14/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	153	180
243166766	10/06/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	137	180
243166808	02/02/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	144	180
243166824	05/19/86	API	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X		180
248178907	04/28/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	153	180
248179046	09/28/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	158	180
248179095	06/21/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	129	180
248179111	10/25/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	152	180
248179129	06/16/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	155	180
248179152	04/22/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
248179244	09/07/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	103	180
248179285	09/12/86	USA	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
248179293	05/09/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	153	180
248179889	06/25/86	USA	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
248688657	04/08/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
250741774	02/02/86	USA	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	144	180
250758802	11/05/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X		180
250784360	01/27/86	H	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	167	180
250855475	11/30/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	143	180
250888708	03/31/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	155	180
251026548	11/07/86	USA	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	139	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	26	3,443	4,680

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: Kindergarten-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
243166634	11/12/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
243166683	07/23/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	120	180
247969488	12/05/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	152	180
247985120	08/16/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
247994981	11/30/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	129	180
248097933	09/01/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
248107443	05/21/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	157	180
248108391	05/25/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	144	180
248163776	10/04/86	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	139	180
248164485	12/13/86	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
248165631	02/02/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	152	180
248178865	09/12/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	149	180
248179145	08/23/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
248179178	11/27/86	H	English	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
248179228	05/11/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
250761772	07/28/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
250766581	12/24/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
250766714	04/12/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
250784675	05/31/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
250829793	10/03/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	148	180
251025904	09/09/86	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	103	180
251026209	08/26/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	66	180
251026225	06/14/86	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
251026233	07/13/86	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	24	3,563	4,320

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 1st-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
237497227	08/18/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	148	180
237559877	10/08/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	144	180
241309897	03/06/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
243166360	01/31/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	60	180
243168135	10/28/85	H	Spanish	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
244917985	02/11/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
245132188	07/19/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
245132212	08/26/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
245132238	07/10/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
245132279	10/07/85	4	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
245132337	06/15/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	139	180
245132352	03/27/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
245132360	03/27/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
245132378	06/16/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	161	180
245132451	08/01/85	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
245132840	03/01/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
248182206	05/07/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
250855806	09/10/85	5	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	156	180
250894011	04/05/85	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	19	2,826	3,420

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 1st-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
237497227	08/18/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	148	180
237559877	10/08/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	144	180
241309897	03/06/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
243166360	01/31/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	63	180
243168135	10/28/85	H	Spanish	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
244917985	02/11/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
245132188	07/19/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
245132212	08/26/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
245132238	07/10/85	H	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
245132279	10/07/85	4	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
245132337	06/15/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	139	180
245132352	03/27/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
245132360	03/27/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
245132378	06/16/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	161	180
245132451	08/01/85	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
245132840	03/01/85	4	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
248182206	05/07/85	5	English	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
250855806	09/10/85	5	English	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	156	180
250894011	04/05/85	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	19	2,826	3,420

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93　　Grade: 2nd-EP　　Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL / ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
234732089	01/03/84	4	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
234732147	06/24/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	156	180
234781953	01/13/84	4	English	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
236037305	10/31/84	4	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
236037412	12/27/84	H	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
236037495	09/10/84	H		N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	135	180
236037547	12/14/83		English	E	4	Y	N	N	N	N/A	X	145	180
236254405	04/04/83	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
237493309	03/02/84	5	PO	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
237496914	11/13/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
237496948	09/26/84	2	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
237496989	10/09/84	5	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
237497029	10/21/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
237497268	08/11/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	154	180
239010028	05/11/84	H	Spanish	E	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	158	180
239047889	01/12/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	127	180
239357429	11/14/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	124	180
241309939	09/01/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
241310382	03/31/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	138	180
241310390	05/16/84	H	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
241310440	04/24/84	4	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	141	180
241410711	07/19/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	151	180
243166253	04/05/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
243273968	03/27/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	163	180
248160475	01/17/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	157	180
248160558	04/06/84	4	English	N	0	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	26	3,872.00	4,680.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 2nd-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
236037461	09/03/84	H	Spanish	N	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	155	180
237496872	08/17/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
237497052	08/27/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
237497219	09/27/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
241308790	03/14/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
241309053	07/01/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
241309855	08/26/84	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
241310184	03/09/84	4	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	135	180
241310275	12/05/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
241310465	02/01/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	141	180
241412618	11/25/84	H	English	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	141	180
243166220	11/18/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	148	180
243166261	02/13/84	4	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
243166279	05/26/84	H	English	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
243166378	10/07/84	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
243167004	05/15/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	149	180
246524078	10/31/84	H	Spanish	N	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	58	180
247137938	02/23/83	H	Spanish	N	1	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
250900412	04/10/84	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	167	180
250900495	04/10/84	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	146	180
251028262	11/13/84	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
251028270	08/15/83	H	Spanish	E	2	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	22	3,263	3,960

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 3rd-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
231927138	01/18/83	H	Spanish	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
234797173	07/23/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
236036636	02/10/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
236229035	08/03/83	4		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
237495841	13/31/83	4		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
237496161	12/26/83	5		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
237496179	04/10/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
237496211	04/18/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
237496237	05/22/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
237496278	08/06/83	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
237496344	07/08/83	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	155	180
237496377	10/30/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	157	180
237497334	07/14/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
237497433	01/27/83	5	English	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
237497656	07/03/83	5		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
237497664	08/16/83	H		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
237583737	10/27/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
237585591	01/26/83	4		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
241305515	08/11/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
241310341	11/03/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
241310523	08/11/83	4		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
241310614	02/23/83	4	English	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
241310671	11/06/83	H	English	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
241310721	04/05/83	4	English	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
248176125	05/21/83	H	Spanish	E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	25	4,187	4,500

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 3rd-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
231805904	08/22/83	4	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
234744415	10/08/83	H	Spanish	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
236037065	12/17/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
237489760	01/25/83	H	Spanish	N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
237496187	07/11/83	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
237496252	03/14/83	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
237496302	12/16/83	H		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
237496690	09/30/83	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	135	180
241310507	10/10/83	H		E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
243164316	11/12/83	H		E	3	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
243164324	01/14/84	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
245133095	03/25/83	H	Spanish	E	0	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
248018160	10/10/83	H	English	E	0	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
				TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	13	2,214.00	2,340.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 4th-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL / ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 - DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
231743790	08/23/82	5		N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
231803487	01/19/82	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
233169465	09/06/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
233169515	08/10/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	150	180
233169606	09/22/82	2	English	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
234550978	11/18/82	4		N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
234732675	02/10/82	H	English	E	0	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
234732709	08/29/82	5		E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
234732949	10/31/82	5	English	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
234733152	12/08/82	4	English	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
234733400	09/13/82	H		E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
235903770	12/31/82	H		E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
237496518	08/22/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
237496658	10/08/82	H		E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
237497342	11/15/82	4	English	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
237497557	12/23/82	4	English	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	154	180
237497573	08/29/82	4		N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
241309707	11/03/81	H		E	6	Y	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
241310077	11/01/82	H		N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
					TOTAL	1	0	0	0	0	19	3,247.00	3,420.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 4th-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL / ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
231806548	09/18/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	160	180
233169390	12/26/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
233169416	09/13/82	H		N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
233169523	01/01/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
234732378	06/25/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	151	180
234732964	10/23/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
236036877	10/28/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
236037560	01/11/82	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	149	180
237496559	01/18/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
239294093	11/08/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
241309905	01/24/82	H	Spanish	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
243166188	08/05/82	H		N	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
250910981	04/03/82	H	Portuguese	N	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
					TOTAL	0	0	0	0	N/A	13	2,211.00	2,340.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 5th-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL / ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS .	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
230044448	06/23/80	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
230048662	03/21/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
231342981	01/10/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
231413006	07/16/81	4		N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
231790932	03/21/81	5	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
231790999	01/27/81	4	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
231791211	08/21/81	4	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
231792276	12/04/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
231792359	02/05/81	H		E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
231792367	01/24/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	149	180
231792425	05/18/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
231792466	05/01/81	5		N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
231792573	06/21/81	5	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	178	180
231792698	08/30/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
231792714	05/06/81	4	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
232023937	01/24/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	161	180
234550952	02/17/81	4	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
234733103	08/01/81	4	NO	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
234733368	05/08/81	5	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
234796142	06/22/81	H	NO	N	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
237491865	01/28/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
245132923	08/05/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	156	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	22	3,578.00	3,960.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 5th-LEP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
229284880	02/07/79	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
230041741	05/23/80	H	Spanish	E	8	Y	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
230044406	11/28/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
233168869	04/30/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
236036794	07/12/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
236036828	06/06/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
236685665	07/29/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	173	180
250900610	04/04/81	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
250900859	02/07/80	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	0	1,390.00	1,620.00

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 1992-93 Grade: 6th-EP Language Proficiency (Circle One): LEP EP

STUDENT I.D.	BIRTH DATE	RACIAL/ ETHNIC BACKGROUND	LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	SES	YEARS OF EDUCATION	RETAINED IN GRADE	LEFT PROJECT	DROPPED OUT	SPECIAL EDUCATION REF. & PLACEMENT	ENROLLMENT IN POST - SEC. INSTIT.	PART. AT LEAST 100 DAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED	NUMBER DAYS ENROLLED
	05/24/83		Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
225211713	05/05/80	H		E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	147	180
225602002	04/14/79	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
225959378	07/18/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
228412714	11/19/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	145	180
229425822	08/11/80	H		E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	171	180
229857990	03/29/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
229863079	01/02/79	H		E	8	Y	N	N	N	N/A	X	162	180
230043895	09/16/80	4	English	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
230044356	01/28/80	H	Spanish	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	165	180
230044380	07/06/80	H	Spanish	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
230044398	09/25/80	H	Spanish	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
230044414	04/23/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	164	180
230044497	02/20/80	H		E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
230044588	12/24/80	H		N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	179	180
230044695	10/31/80	H		N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
230044711	08/11/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	180	180
230044729	10/11/80	4		N	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	170	180
230050551	10/16/80	H	Spanish	E	4	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	176	180
230103327	03/07/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	174	180
230110751	08/22/80	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
230212144	12/21/80	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	91	180
231174673	02/27/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
231308610	01/20/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	175	180
231416132	02/17/80	H	Spanish	E	5	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180

231618109	11/08/80	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	177	180
233168855	04/03/80	H		N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	182	180
233169036	09/22/79	H	Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
233239300	08/05/80	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
234401487	11/03/79	H	Spanish	E	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	181	180
234725885	11/04/79		Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
236046173	10/10/80	H		N	0		N	N	N	N/A	X	0	180
237496740	06/13/80	H	Spanish	N	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	166	180
241326057	09/28/80	4	Spanish	E	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	169	180
243181294	06/13/80	H	Spanish	E	9	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	159	180
243238367	05/13/80	H	Spanish	E	6	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	168	180
245148580	05/30/79		Spanish	E	7	N	N	N	N	N/A	X	172	180
						TOTAL	0	0	0	N/A	37	5,880.00	6,660.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Worksheet 6.2
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

N/A

Comparison Group

Project Year: ______________ Grade: ______________ Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) STUDENT I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7)* Attended School Prior To Entry Into Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educ. Instit.	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
TOTAL														

* Some children who have recently entered the United States have had no schooling in the year prior to entry into the Title VII project. This category is unique to the comparison group and does not appear in the key for non-test data (Worksheet 6.1) The information may be useful in conducting data analyses.

Worksheet 7.1

N/A

Pretest and Posttest Data Record - Project Group

GRADE: ____________ LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY GROUP (Circle One): LEP EP NAME OF TEST: ____________

SUBJECT AREA: ____________ LANGUAGE OF TEST: ____________

(1)	(2)	(3)				(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)				(8)	(9)
STUDENT I.D. NUMBER	NUMBER OF YEARS IN PROJECT	PRETEST				PRE-TESTED LATE	ESTIMATED PRETEST SCORE	ESTIMATED POSTTEST SCORE IF PRETESED LATE	POSTTEST				POST-TESTED EARLY	ESTIMATED POSTEST SCORE
		SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL /FORM				SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL /FORM		
		RAW	SCALE*						RAW	SCALE*				

* Scale scores are given different names by different test publishers. These names include standard scores, expanded standard scores, Achievement Development Scales Scores converted scores, and Growth-Value Scores. All of them refer to specially constructed scales that span the various levels of a particular test and thus provide a vehicle for converting raw scores on various forms and levels of a test to a common score base or metric.

Worksheet 7.2

Pretest and Posttest Data Record - Comparison Group

N/A

GRADE: ____________ LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY GROUP (Circle One): LEP EP NAME OF TEST: ____________

SUBJECT AREA: ____________ LANGUAGE OF TEST: ____________

(1)	(2)	(3)				(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)				(8)	(9)
STUDENT I.D. NUMBER	NUMBER* OF YEARS IN PROJECT	PRETEST				PRE-TESTED LATE	ESTIMATED PRETEST SCORE	ESTIMATED POSTTEST SCORE IF PRETESTED LATE	POSTTEST				POST-TESTED EARLY	ESTIMATED POSTEST SCORE
		SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL /FORM				SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL /FORM		
		RAW	SCALE*						RAW	SCALE*				

* Number of Years in Project. Include this information for the comparison group only if applicable.

* Scale scores are given different names by different test publishers. These names include standard scores, expended standard scores, Achievement Development Scales Scores converted scores, and Growth-Value Scores. All of them refer to specially constructed scales that span the various levels of a particular test and thus provide a vehicle for converting raw scores on various forms and levels of a test to a common score base or metric.

N/A

Worksheet 7.3
Data Record - Former Project Students

Grade:____________ Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

Name of Test:____

Subject Area:__________________________ Language of Test:________________

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				(5)			
STUDENT I.D. NUMBER	NUMBER OF YEARS IN PROJECT	DATE EXITED PROJECT	POST PROJECT TEST 1				POST PROJECT TEST 2			
			SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL /FORM	SCORE		DATE TAKEN	LEVEL/ FORM
			RAW	SCALE*			RAW	SCALE*		

* Scale scores are given different names by different test publishers. These names include standard scores, expanded standard scores, Achievement Development Scale Scores, converted scores, and Growth-Value Scores. All of them refer to specially constructed scales that span the various levels of a particular test and thus provide a vehicle for converting raw scores on various forms and levels of a test to a common score base or metric.

Directions for completing Worksheet 7.4: Qualitative Measures. N/A

Some projects will use non-standardized measures to evaluate project students. Such measures may include writing samples, reading samples, emergent reading skills checklists, and criterion referenced tests. If applicable to your project, please fill in the following information for each alternative measure you wish to report.

In column 1, enter student I.D. numbers. These will be the same as reported in Section 6.
In column 2, indicate the prescore the student received and the date the prescore was obtained.
Please report prescores in whole numbers.
In column 3, do the same for postscores.

Grade Level: ____________ Language Group: ____________
Subject Area: ____________
Kind of Measure (i.e. reading sample, writing sample, criterion-referenced test): ____________
Skills Assessed by this Measure: ____________
Kind of Score Reported (i.e., percentile, number of objectives completed, raw score): ____________
Range of Scores: ____________
Score Indicating Mastery: ____________

Worksheet 7.4
Qualitative Measures

(1)	(2)		(3)	
STUDENT I.D. NUMBER	PRETEST		POST TEST	
	SCORE	DATE	SCORE	DATE